

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1886.

I.

* NATIONAL CHRISTIANITY AND AMERICAN CHURCH UNION.

BY PROF. THOS. G. APPLE, D.D.

1. NATIONAL CHRISTIANITY.

IN speaking of what we designate National Christianity we mean not for a moment to question or overlook the catholicity of Christianity. The Christian religion, unlike ethnic religions, is a religion for the whole human race. Its founder is the Son of Man as well as the Son of God, and therefore He is the Saviour and Lord of all men. Other religions are limited to a certain nation or people, and though they seek to make proselytes, yet they do not lay claim to the homage of all mankind. Christianity is the only universal religion.

How, then, can we speak of Christianity as being national? We reply that there is no contradiction between the two conceptions. The greater may include the less. A catholic religion may be at the same time national, whilst a merely human ethnic religion cannot be catholic. Literature and art are uni-

* Not until this article was in the hands of the printer did we see the able article of Prof. Ch. W. Shields, in the *Century* for November, on the same general subject. Had we seen it earlier we would have referred to it in the body of our article.

versal human interests, and in one sense they know no national boundaries, whilst yet they may take coloring from nationality.

Christianity, as a new life introduced into the world, enters as a leaven into all forms of the world's life and assimilates itself with them, while it elevates them into its own higher sphere. The two forms of life come into organic union. It is easy to understand how the lower is elevated by the higher, but it may not be so clear that the higher is also modified by its contact with the lower. Nationality, or national life, may be Christianized, but can Christianity be nationalized? We think it can be, and is, whenever the two come into union, and it is our purpose to attempt to establish this truth as a preparation for, and introduction to, our remarks on American Church Union.

Perhaps our proposition may not appear so strange if we state it in this form, viz. : That Christianity, though essentially one and the same, nevertheless becomes modified in its form by the character of the people among whom it is introduced. Just as there are types of theology in the New Testament,—a Petrine, a Pauline and a Johannean,—so there are national types of Christianity. At first view this may seem to contradict the teaching of St. Paul, that Christianity did away with the distinction between Jew and Gentile, so that all became one—one new man—in Christ; yet the fact remains that there was a Jewish type of Christianity and a Gentile type. Essentially they were one, in such sense that the partition wall was broken down and both came directly into union with the new life of Christianity, so that it was not necessary for the Gentile to become a Jew first before he could become a Christian; yet, as to form, the two types continued until they were gradually moulded more and more into one. But this gradual moulding into one, even as to outward form, in the early church was possible because Judaism gradually passed away as a nationality.

Had the Jewish nationality been preserved in its integrity, the Christian Church established in that nation would have retained permanently a different type from that of the Church

in Greece or Rome. The Jewish type gradually died out because there was no more Jewish material—Jewish people—to be taken into the Church.

When we come to study Christianity in Greece and Rome we see how it took to itself a peculiar type from the different character and culture of these two peoples. This would doubtless have been still more marked had each retained its own nationality; but we know that Grecian civilization and culture became swallowed up in the great Roman Empire. Even as it was, however, with both peoples, the Greeks and the Latins, amalgamated in one all-absorbing nationality, there still was a difference between the Greek and the Latin Churches. Greek theology and Latin theology were of different types. We might specify points of difference here between Christianity as apprehended by the Greek mind and the Roman mind, and as it took up Greek culture and Roman culture, but this seems unnecessary after we have stated the general fact, which, we think, will be admitted by every student of early Christianity.

The same general truth becomes still more evident as we examine the Christianity of the Western Empire, which came to be known in church history as *Latin Christianity*.

This title does not merely designate Christianity as established among the Latin nation or race, but it means a certain marked type of Christianity, as distinguished, for instance, from the now separate Greek Church, or the church among the modern Teutonic race. The Roman national life and spirit, whilst it became Christianized, yet retained in its Christian form its own marked characteristics. Especially do we note the element of strong governmental power and tendency to centralization which it carried with it into the Christian Church. This gave to history the Latin or *Roman Catholic Church*.

It may be said, indeed, that, so far as these national or race types remained and asserted themselves, they produced only a perversion of pure Christianity, a monstrosity in the papal hierarchy, and therefore this would rather prove that such natural characteristics ought not to modify Christianity; but this is

not a proper inference. It is true the domineering Roman spirit did assert itself in unlawful ways during the Middle Ages, but this does not change the truth that national traits have a legitimate function in a Christianized national life. The time has passed by when Protestants can see only perversion and evil in the Latin Church of the Mediæval period. Even the papacy itself, corrupt and tyrannical as it became, yet had a relative historical necessity. For that semi-barbarous age, when a strong governmental power was necessary, it was better that the tyranny that was exercised should be that of the church rather than that of the State; an ecclesiastical Cæsarism was preferable to a political Cæsarism.

But in the bosom of Latin Christianity during the Middle Ages there grew up, again, other subordinate types of Christianity. We might stop here to notice the change that was wrought by the new material in general that came into the church by the invasion of the northern tribes, the Teutonic race, as distinguished from the Latin race. These northern tribes, taken altogether, had natural traits and characteristics different from those of the Roman race. There is a truth in what *Guizot* advances in regard to their love of personal freedom, their regard for the female sex, and their deep mysticism as elements that entered into and modified the civilization and Christianity of the Mediæval period, notwithstanding the able and eloquent rebuttal of his theory by the Spanish writer *Balmes*. There was already in the spirit of the Teutonic people a preparation from the natural side for the Reformation.

But it is more directly to our purpose to notice the effect upon Christianity of the rise of nationalities in the development of European civilization. Although this effect was largely suppressed by the strong centralizing power of Rome, which sought even to prevent the rise of, or rather use of, national vernacular tongues in theology and the church service, yet there was a strong tendency to assert the rights and prerogatives of *national churches*. Thus there grew up what came to be

designated as *Gallicanism* in France. Christianity gradually assumed an independent type in England, and the same was the case in Germany. The free development of national types was, as we have said, suppressed by the strong power, ambition and cupidity of Rome. The Latin language was used, and its use was enforced in the church-service in all the nations of Europe. Italy exercised undue control in other nations. At the time of the Reformation, even in remote England and Scotland, a large portion of the priests were Italians, and at the Council of Trent the representatives from Italy outnumbered (187) the delegates from all the other nations combined (93). Yet we say, in spite of this, Christianity gradually became nationalized while nationalities were being Christianized.

History therefore confirms what we think is philosophically evident on this subject. While Christianity by its catholicity tends to bring all the nations into the unity of a common brotherhood, and thus, in one view, to break down national walls of separation, yet in another view it makes room for the free development of national life. In order to do this it conforms itself to national peculiarities, just as Paul said, in a good sense, he became all things to all men. This truth is coming to be recognized in the foreign missionary work. Christianity in Japan will have to work out for itself a form adapted to that Oriental nationality. It would be unnatural to import all the forms of church life and organization in an external and mechanical way to that nation from the Christian nations of the Occident.

In the Roman Empire the provinces of the Church were conformed to the political divisions of the State. Monarchical government prevailed in that empire and the church government took to itself a monarchical form. In reference to external forms that are not essential, the church will naturally sympathize with the government of the nation in which it exists. It has a flexibility which enables it to do this. Its government may be monarchical, having its head in an Archbishop or Metropolitan or in a Patriarchate, in which these offices are, of

course, only a primacy *inter pares*, or it may be governed by a republican form of government by delegated Synods or General Assemblies. There is a great truth lying at the foundation of national churches, though the national church need not necessarily be an establishment united with the State.

America has no national church, but in place of it there will be a historical tendency towards a national Christianity. It is not difficult to see how this tendency is working and what it has already accomplished. Even the Roman Church, which, by its peculiar organization and genius, is least affected by diversities of national life, is *sui generis* in this country. Imperceptibly it moulds and adapts itself to the national spirit. It is not in America just what it is in Italy. The Episcopal Church of this country is becoming moulded by the spirit of our nationality. It has no Archbishopric here. All the churches of this country sympathize more or less in their government and the spirit of their government with our republican institutions. They have annual or periodical legislative bodies that stand at the head, and these most generally are representative bodies. The Episcopal Church has its dioceses or bishoprics, more or less determined as to their boundaries by State lines, while the Roman Church holds to the old metropolitan centres.

The point to which our argument thus far tends is that Christianity has a peculiar work to accomplish in this country, and in doing this work, in Christianizing our civilization and moulding our nationality, all the churches come under a general spirit which we have denominated a national Christianity, and in this common spirit we propose to find a basis for church union in this country. If our argument has force, it will enable us to build up a plea for church union, not as something that is to be brought about by an external plan merely, but as something grounded in a deep internal necessity. A national Christianity will eventually seek for itself some adequate external union of the churches. The question is in what manner this tendency towards union will be able best to work out its results. This we think is a vital question for the Chris-

tianity of America, as now already one among the first powers on the globe, and as carrying in it responsibilities in relation to the future more weighty than those of any nation on earth. America is emphatically the land of the future, and Christianity in this land may be expected to work out a new and original problem in church history.

There is one point that may be urged yet in favor of Christianity being joined with the national life in the sense we have tried to explain, and that is this: There are questions that pertain to the sphere of both Church and State at the same time, and in reference to these Christianity should assert itself. We have not in mind in this a union of Church and State, as this union existed in the Middle Ages or now exists in Europe; but even where they are separate, as in this country, still there is a common territory which both occupy. There are questions that are both political and religious, such, for instance, as marriage or the keeping of the Sabbath.

This must be the case if we consider that the Evangelical Churches of this country must have a common work to perform in dealing with the peculiar civilization of this nation. Especially in dealing with great moral questions that pertain to the public welfare must they feel called upon to unite their influence and power. Christianity is not a theory or an abstraction. It is not satisfied to deal with generalities, but with human life as concrete. Hence it must make application of its teaching to the condition of society in the midst of which it is established, and this will give a national tinge to its workings.

Christianity in America has entered upon its work under different conditions as compared with its work in other nations. There is something new here, although we are accustomed to think of this country's civilization as but a continuation of that of Europe. For the first time in history, so far as I know, whether in heathen or Christian nations, Church and State started out in their history here as separate. This was in part at least, perhaps a matter of theory or calculation, but it was mainly a matter of sheer necessity. So many different churches

were already in existence here when our nation had its birth that it was simply an impossibility to have a national church. French infidelity doubtless had something to do with the separation of Church and State then advocated in America, and the spirit of Protestantism no doubt tended, unconsciously it may be, towards the freedom of religion, but the framers of our Constitution could do no otherwise than proclaim all forms of religion free and equal before the organic law of this new republic.

Yet, for all this, the external, legal separation could not and cannot prevent the one form from freely influencing the other. The influence is mutual. Christianity here takes coloring from our free institutions and our national life becomes Christian. Just now the churches, some of them at least, are working together to overcome the monster evil of intemperance by influencing the organic law, by seeking to secure prohibitory legislation. This might seem to be interfering in politics but it shows that the church is impelled to work in upon the national life; and this mutual working will bring with it a sense of church unity, while it will render the method of working American,—that is, it will conform to the spirit and genius of our republican nationality. We reach the same conclusion here that there is a sense in which the Christianity of this country must become national-American.

The significance of this will be found, of course, more fully in the future. America is the land of the future and church history here may be expected to develop some new features in coming years. How will the numerous churches of this country give expression to this national Christianity? This question brings us to the second part of our subject.

II. AMERICAN CHURCH UNION.

A great deal of serious thought has been given to the subject of church union viewed under different aspects. The divisions of Protestantism are more open in their working results in this country than in Europe, just because of the freedom

enjoyed here and also because America gathers into itself the religion of all lands. In Europe there are divisions also, but there the national churches give a predominating influence to some one religious body.

The subject has been studied in reference to the church itself. Christianity is one, it must be a unity, and as such it should actualize this unity in outward form.

Sectarianism is opposed to the catholicity of the church; it is a disease of Protestantism. We think that denominational Christianity has some claims to be a legitimate outgrowth of Protestantism and therefore it is not just the same as sectarianism. Still it has been felt that the church should be one in outward form as it is one in inward life and spirit; and therefore much thought has been devoted to the problem: How are these different denominations to be united?

Then, also, the question has been studied from the standpoint of the necessities of the secular and ethical life of the nation. How can the churches overcome the moral evils of the country in their divided condition? Each one can, indeed, perform a certain work for itself. It can make converts and thus work upon individual life, but this is not the whole work the church must accomplish. It must also leaven and mould organic forms of social life, the family, the State, education, science, etc., etc. And to stem the tide of growing unbelief, must not the strength of the church be united? These questions are pressing for solution.

ORGANIC DENOMINATIONAL UNION NOT PRACTICABLE.

We do not like the use of the word *organic* in this connection, for we are accustomed to look upon the Christian Church, as a whole, as an organic unity, the body of Christ, and the use of this word in such connection would seem to imply that the different Christian denominations are not organically united. But the word is generally used in the sense of external organization, and the meaning here is, that a merging of all denominations into one external organization is not practicable. Nor do we think it is a necessity for the organic unity of the church.

This organic unity, which is one of the essential characteristics, or attributes, of the holy catholic church, according to Protestant doctrine, holds primarily in the union of all true believers in Christ. This may not find an adequate expression at any one time in the external organization of the church, and yet the unity of life remains. There was no such external unity of organization in the primitive church in the earliest period. Before the papacy arose, such unity was sought to be actualized in the Apostolic tradition, then in the œcumenical councils, and only afterwards in the Roman See; and yet all the while the Christian Church was organically one. The human race is an organic unity, and yet this unity is but inadequately expressed in external organization.

We say this in order to show that the denominational form of Protestant Christianity is not necessarily inconsistent with the true organic unity of the church. It is, we may suppose, an intermestic form of the church, and we may hope that, at least, the divisory element in it will eventually pass away. But for the present we do not think the organized union of all evangelical denominations in this country is at all practicable. To strive for this before the time is to expend energy in vain.

There was a historical necessity for the rise of denominations, as much, to say the least, as there was for the rise of the papacy. The freedom of thought developed in the Reformation led to confessionalism. The different sections of Protestantism wrought out different lines of theological thinking. The Reformation developed no new creed, but it did develop new theologies that were embodied in new confessions. And these have served a good purpose. They formulated the faith of Protestantism over against the old catholic theology, and against the various forms of positive unbelief. The age of confessionalism, or the scholastic period of Protestantism, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was by no means a barren age, although it is now left behind, and ought to be superseded, as it is rapidly being superseded, by a more catholic, positive age of unity. The Reformation Confessions have, for the most

part, done their work. They will live on for years as landmarks of the different denominations, and as bearing the results of earnest theological contests, but they cannot be vitalized as they once were. The time is coming when these confessions will gradually merge into a *consensus*, which will retain all that is essential but relegate to theology, as such, whatever is not essential to faith for salvation. The different schools of theology will likely, also, come together in a Christological theology. The old will not be lost, not be labor expended in vain, but it will be taken up as to its results in the new. This is felt everywhere. The old Shibboleths are losing their power. The peculiarities of the old confessions are not now made most prominent, but that which they have in common.

But before this confessional union comes, it will most likely be preceded by a *practical work in the churches*.

CO-OPERATIVE CHURCH UNION.

There have been, in a comparatively recent period, several movements that look towards a practical, co-operative union of the evangelical churches of the world. First came the World's Evangelical Alliance, and then more recently the Alliance of Reformed Churches, which promises good results. These movements manifested the catholicity of the church, in that it showed that the church is not divided by oceans and seas, nor by national boundaries. We speak from personal experience when we say that the Reformed Alliance has served to bring the churches of which it is composed nearer together, and also to open up avenues of common work.

Why might not such a movement be started for this country? We have seen, we think, that there is a basis for it in a growing national Christianity. It would not be a movement stimulated by a mere external theory or plan, nor would it be merely to bring about a closer union of the churches, as a good *per se*, but it would have a practical end in view. Great and important practical work remains to be done by the churches of this

country, which cannot well be done without their co-operative union.

We are well aware that this is no new proposition. Already some movements on a small scale have taken place, looking in this direction, as, for instance, the Congress of Churches, held at Hartford, and noticed in this Review. We may say in general that the prevailing tendency among the different churches in this country is towards union. The Presbyterian Church has healed the schism between the two schools. The Lutheran Church is moving in the same direction, though the progress, it must be confessed, has been very slow. The Methodist Church at least seems to feel the influence of the tendency. Perhaps one part of the general movement would be for those denominations that have been broken into fragments by divisive forces to come together. Their division has resulted, in some cases, from political divisions. The churches of the same denomination North and South seem to be as far apart as different denominations in the same section. This, however, will ere long pass away. When once the sectional feeling caused by the Civil War has died out, these bodies, we may suppose, will come together again. There is no sufficient reason, we now believe, why the two Reformed Churches, the Dutch and the German, should not be united. Separate, each one is comparatively weak; united, they would become one of the strongest denominations in this country, and adequately represent the old Reformation title *reformed*.

But these are only preliminary movements. There is a call for some closer union of all the evangelical churches of this country, and we believe the time is near at hand when there will be a ripeness for such union. We advocate what we have designated a co-operative union. Such a movement might be started by a preliminary meeting composed of one delegate, or more, from each evangelical denomination, to consider some constitution, or order, according to which subsequent meetings might be held. It would be the formation of an Alliance.

This country was once a number of colonies. It grew into a

nation. Why should not there be a confederation of churches, in which a permanent union might result, while each denomination could retain its relative independence, as in the case of the States? Such a body, for a time at least, perhaps permanently, would be advisory, not legislative. It would soon grow in influence and weight if there is a real inward call for it. The first immediate effect, we believe, would be to create a feeling of unity. The delegates would be liberal-minded men, who have studied the church question, who understand the peculiarities of the different denominations, and who have grown largely in charity in recent years,—we mean in charity towards each other's denominations. A mingling together of such representative men, and a comparison of views on the great centralities of Christianity, would produce the most happy results in the Alliance itself. This feeling would go out and into the different bodies represented. There would be an interchange of courtesy and confidence in congregations of different denominations corresponding to those exchanged in such representative body. Nay, we should not wonder at all if the process of union here, among the people, should outrun that among the clergy and theologians. Already, in towns and districts, churches are coming together in a way that would have been surprising a quarter of a century ago.

The first objection we hear to such an Alliance is, *cui bono?* What good would there be in such a demonstration? It would look like a mere show, without any corresponding results. It would be a body without power. No denomination would be bound by its conclusions. Before we proceed to answer the main objection, as to practical results, we may say that this one, that its decisions would pass unheeded, is not, in our judgment, well founded. Why should not its conclusions have weight and authority? We Protestants profess to believe in the power of truth, independent of coercion; and if such a body should speak forth great truths, we believe its weight and authority would grow. If not, it would be evident that it was not possessed of the requisite wisdom, and it would have to

grow in that requisite. Some might fear that its authority would become too great, and thus tend gradually to interfere with the proper freedom and independence of separate denominations; but this could only be by the free adhesion of those bodies themselves, and against this there is certainly no valid objection.

But now let us consider what practical good might be accomplished by such an alliance or confederation.

One difficulty in bringing the influence of the church to bear upon questions of a public character in this country, consists in the fact that it is divided into so many denominations, and, therefore, there is no united deliverance practicable. One body may give utterance to its opinion, or decision, and others may sympathize with it; but if they do not take simultaneous action, the decision goes for one body, but not for the whole church. During the late Civil War ministers were drafted into the army and compelled to bear arms, whereas certain sects, as Quakers and Dunkers, were excused because they had religious scruples in regard to bearing arms or engaging in warfare. In all ages and in all countries, the church, when it has made utterance upon the subject, has held that it was inconsistent with the profession of the ministry to engage in bearing arms, though ministers might serve as chaplains. Individual ministers, or the ministry of a single denomination, would not like to urge objections to the draft, for they are not wanting either in patriotism or personal courage. But if a body, representing all the churches, had decided that ministers should not go to war, except as chaplains, or spiritual advisers, and attendants upon the wounded, sick and dying, who does not believe that the government would have respected such a decision, and, at least, made it optional for a drafted minister to choose to act as chaplain, or bear arms, so as to save the consciences of those who had religious scruples on the subject? It was not the fault of the government that no such option was granted, but it was owing to want of united action on the part of the church.

Or, as perhaps a better example, take the question of mar-

riage and divorce, that is exciting deep interest at the present time, both in Church and State. Here we have a question that pertains to both institutions. Marriage is at the same time a religious and a civil institution. It is of divine ordainment. The State has to do with it so far as it affects the civil relations of its citizens, and the Church is the guardian of its religious character. But these two cannot be separated. What is the true idea of marriage, and how is its purity to be protected? In a nation like ours, where the citizens are predominantly Christian, the Church has a right to ask of the State that it shall maintain monogamy, and not polygamy. It has a right, moreover, to ask the State to defend the purity of marriage by making its divorce laws conform to the Christian law. We do not intend to argue here what that law is, but, whatever it is, it should receive the respect of the civil power. It is for the interest of the State to respect that law, because whatever undermines the integrity of the family is injurious to the civil welfare of the people of the nation.

But who is authorized to declare this divine law in regard to marriage and divorce? The churches, now and then, pass resolutions on this subject, but there has been, as yet, no unanimous utterance from all the churches, simply because they have no organ of utterance. Of course the State would not be bound, except morally, to heed such an utterance, but the government of this country has always paid high respect to Christianity, as the religion of the great body of its population, and there is no reason to suppose it would treat such a unanimous declaration otherwise. And this, not on the ground that it favors one religion above another in any way contrary to the fundamental law, but because it would be found that the Christian idea of marriage is according to the truest and best morality. In this view our government sets itself against the polygamy of the Mormons. Now can the Christianity of this country rest satisfied so long as the evil power encourages, or allows, a system of laws to prevail that undermine the Scripture ideal of an institution that lies at the foundation of the

family? And if not, must not the Churches of this great nation speak a unanimous voice on this subject?

Then, again, a contest is going on at this time in regard to the kind of a Sabbath, or Lord's day, this Christian country is finally to have. The contest is between the Puritan idea and that of the continent of Europe. Suppose neither is exactly according to the New Testament idea. Who is to decide and determine this, if not the Churches? But what are they doing to decide and determine it? We have Sabbath societies working in the matter, but what is this to a harmonious utterance from all the Evangelical Churches of the land? They themselves are not agreed on this subject, it may be said. That is the difficulty, but they have never really come together in order to compare notes, and see how far they disagree. We think if there were such a consideration, under a full sense of the responsibility it involves, perhaps there would be greater harmony than is supposed.

We might go on naming subjects that are of vital importance to the future character of the civilization of this country. The temperance question is another. There is no common understanding at present among the Churches on this subject, and yet they claim to be the leaders of public opinion on great questions of social morality. The work of saving our great cities from lapsing into heathenism, and worse than heathenism, is another. The work of missions in the great West is another. But we cannot continue this enumeration. It is sufficient if we have shown that there are great practical questions that demand the united influence of the Churches, in order to settle them in accordance with the spirit of Christianity.

The danger is, that, with our theory of the separation of Church and State, we may be cultivating a double-headed monster of civilization in this new world that will confront us with its terrors only when it is too late. We may so separate religion from the government as to be cultivating a heathen civilization alongside of Christianity, and thus prepare the way for a conflict between them in the end. The thought is coming

to be wide-spread that the province of the State is limited to man's mere temporal welfare, or rather, to his mere physical well-being, and his personal and property rights, etc. And yet we teach that the State is from God, and is responsible to Him. Even on the supposition that it is to serve man's purely worldly interests, yet, in order to do this, it must care for the moral, because physical or worldly well-being must be based on true morality. And morality must have back of it religion. The State is bound to provide for the education of its citizens, and it is bound to protect and encourage religion, the Church, and science and works of charity. Though its province may be said to be to govern man in his secular interests, yet it must look to something higher in order to do this aright.

But it is the Church that must permeate and mould political life, and save it from corruption. We are prepared to hear it said "the Church has enough to do to keep itself from corruption," but Christianity is the salt of the earth, and the power of Christianity must reveal itself through imperfect men.

Of course, in what we have said on this subject, we have not intended to designate or dictate any precise method by which Church union for co-operation shall be effected. If there is a call for it, as we believe there is, the method will be found. We mention an Alliance as one of the ways in which the different bodies can at least consult on the subject. If such a body were formed, merely to have papers read by the strongest and best men in the Churches on the defence of Christianity against unbelief, this itself, we believe, would abundantly pay for all the trouble and expense that might be required.

Of one thing we feel certain: either the Churches must come into closer union and co-operation voluntarily, of their own free choice, or they will be driven to it by necessity. Perhaps it is to come in this latter way. Our civilization will go on, becoming more and more corrupt, our industrial troubles will increase, socialism and infidelity spread and conquer the masses, until some calamity will reveal the extent of the danger and the evil, and then, for self-defence, the Churches will come

together for common action. To save the civilization of this mighty nation from lapsing to barbarism, or sinking into fatal corruption, like that of Rome, will require the utmost power of the Christian religion. Intelligence cannot save it; that has been tried. Mere natural morality cannot. Only the leaven of the highest and best religion the world has ever known, the religion of Jesus Christ, can do it.

It would seem to be not difficult to make trial of such co-operative union. The Churches could each appoint a delegate, or delegates, to meet and consider the matter. We believe it is practicable, and, though it may be postponed, though the time may not be ripe for it as yet, the time will come, we feel assured, when the Christianity of America, this nation of the future, will speak in unison and harmony on all great questions that relate to the preservation of our civilization. With the highest freedom in regard to the relation of Church and State, America will remain a Christian nation, and bear up the brightest hopes of the future of our race.

II.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL ECONOMY.

BY REV. W. RUPP.

THERE is no doubt that large portions of the poorer classes of society in this country have become profoundly alienated from the Christian Church. The fact is, indeed, sometimes denied; and yet no careful observer of current events can fail to be convinced of its existence. The complaint comes from all directions that the laboring men do not attend church. There are, no doubt, some of this class in all communities who are still loyal to religion, and still attend public worship; but the large body of workingmen in cities and towns, and even in larger villages, though they may still profess some sort of religion, have become deeply dissatisfied with the Christian Church, and are rarely, if ever, found inside of a sanctuary. They feel somehow that they do not receive that recognition from the Church which is due to them as men. They have an idea that the Church is peculiarly an institution of the rich, and that she is in special league with the power of *capital*, which they regard as their enemy and oppressor, and with which they are always more or less at war. They are fixed in the opinion that she does at least not sympathize with them in their efforts to improve their condition, and to get a fair chance to enjoy their due portion of the blessings of life; and they, therefore, denounce her at times in no measured or gentle terms.

And yet it cannot be denied that the Church has always been tenderly solicitous for the happiness of the poor, and for the comfort of the suffering and distressed. One of the very offices

involved in her organization had its origin in her concern for the wants of the poor, and has always had more or less relation to this class. She has always recognized it to be her special duty to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to minister to the sick, to visit and relieve the prisoner, and to comfort the distressed and sorrowing. There have been times in her history when she looked upon the poor in her communion as her peculiar treasures, the chief crown of her glory, and when she was ready to melt down her very communion vessels in order that she might have the means of ministering to their wants. And it cannot be truthfully charged that she has, in these latter days, denied her character in this regard. She is as active now, and as busy, as she has ever been in the performance of works of charity and mercy. Large sums of money are daily spent by Christian people in the various forms of public and private charity for which this age is distinguished. In times of public calamity, in seasons of suffering and distress, the church is always at hand with her money and her services, ready to minister to all who may be in need of help. Food and clothing and fuel are freely distributed to the poor. The sick and afflicted are cared for, and provided with many comforts. Asylums and hospitals are erected, at vast expense, for the accommodation and comfort of the blind and the deaf, and of those unfortunate classes of men in general, who, in other ages and among other people receive, but little attention and sympathy. It may be said, indeed, that all the money that is expended in these various forms of charity is not contributed by the Church or by Christian people; but that much of it comes from persons who are not members of the Church, or even believers in Christianity. This may be admitted; but it must be admitted likewise that the spirit which prompts this charity has been awakened and fostered only by the Christian Church, and does not exist where the influence of Christianity is not felt. It is the Church that has infused into the mind of modern society that sentiment of humanity which moves men to sympathize with others' sorrows, and makes them willing to

give of their substance for the relief of others' distress. In this way the Church has already done a great deal, and is doing a great deal now, to make the lot of the poor less hard, and the pain of the suffering less keen, than they would otherwise have been. These are facts which are not to be denied, and which the bitterest opponent of the Church will hardly venture to question.

But the question may be raised, whether, in doing all this, the Church is after all fulfilling her saving mission among men, and doing all that the condition of humanity requires in order to its thorough and permanent amelioration. All this, it may be said, is only relieving the outward symptoms of the evil that afflicts humanity, without reaching to the root of the evil itself. It is well, certainly, to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked; but it would be better if the hungry and the naked were always able to feed and clothe themselves. It is well to give alms to the poor; but it would be better for the poor themselves if they could be put into such condition that they would not need to ask for alms. It is well to build orphan asylums and hospitals for the sick; but it would be better if all children and sick persons could be cared for in the bosom of the family into which the providence of God has placed them. It is well to make efforts to rescue the fallen and to reform the criminal; but it would be better if there were no fallen men and women to rescue and no criminals to reform. To prevent disease by the prudent application of hygienic principles is better than to heal disease by the best medical practice; and so, to prevent disorder and wrong in the social system would be better than simply to relieve the pain occasioned by such disorder and wrong.

It may be said, indeed, that the suppositions here made are visionary, and that, as human nature is now constituted and human society organized, there is no possibility that they should ever be realized. This may readily be admitted; but the admission should not be accepted as ending all further inquiry in regard to the subject of human distress and suffering, and as

preventing us from entertaining any better hope for the future of humanity. Certainly as human nature is now constituted, and human society organized, there can be no expectation of any material reduction in the amount of poverty and its concomitant evils. But, it may be asked, does Christianity contemplate that human nature and society should always remain what they are at present? Does it not rather contemplate that both should undergo a very great change? Is it not the aim of Christianity to produce such a change? Certainly both human nature and human society are capable of changing. In passing from a savage to a civilized condition, for instance, the nature of man undergoes a very radical change—a change affecting all his feelings, desires, ideas and sentiments; and as for the organization of society, history presents so many examples of development and change, and these are so well known, that it is not necessary to do more than simply to refer to the fact. It is not unreasonable, then, to expect as great, and even greater, changes in the future. Of course, no possible change of human nature, and no possible reconstruction of human society, so long as humanity is still engaged in the process of moral development, could ever be expected to do away with all inequality and wrong among men, to remove all poverty and want, and to turn the earth into an economic paradise. The poor we shall, no doubt, always have with us, according to our Lord's distinct declaration; but who can say how much the amount of poverty may be diminished, and its concomitant evils mitigated, by a more comprehensive application of the principles of the Gospel to the organization of society, and to the forms and modes of human activity?

What is the cause of the poverty, the suffering and the distress which the Church is constantly trying to relieve? In a general way it may be said to be sin. In a world without sin, there would, no doubt, be inequalities among men too, and some would have more of the substance of the world than others. The very idea of an organized society among men implies differences of position and fortune, answering to differ-

ences of physical and mental endowment. But in a world without sin, these differences, instead of leading to the advancement of some, and to the oppression and destruction of others, would minister to the happiness of all. The strong would exist and live for the benefit of the weak, no less than the weak for the benefit of the strong. There would in this case be no poverty among men,—that is, no deprivation of the means of existence or comfort. The ultimate cause of poverty, then, with all the misery which it implies, is sin. But while this is true, it would not be correct to say that the individual's fortune is always in proportion to his merit or demerit in a moral regard. To the question, Who has sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born poor? the answer must often be, Neither. The poverty of the poor is not always the consequence of their personal sins, as little as the wealth of the rich is always the result of moral excellence on their part. On the contrary, we believe that much the greater part of the want and distress which humanity is suffering are the result of the peculiar organization and action of society itself, for which the rich and the strong are responsible, rather than the poor and the weak.

Among the proximate causes of destitution among men may be mentioned, first of all, *personal depravity*. There are, no doubt, those among the poor whose destitution is the result of their own perversity and criminal conduct, and who are, therefore, morally responsible for it. The indispensable conditions of escaping poverty and of securing the means of subsistence are labor, in some form, and the right management of the products of labor. But some may be unwilling to labor and prefer to live in idleness, while others waste the fruit of their labor in riotous living, in intemperance, for instance, and other forms of sin, and thus involve themselves and those dependent upon them in penury and want. This personal depravity, indeed, may often be the effect of heredity, or at least of foreign influences, for which the individual is not responsible; but this fact, though it may serve to palliate, does not annul the indi-

vidual's guilt. Another immediate cause of destitution is *inability to earn the means of subsistence* in consequence of physical or mental weakness. Under this head may be mentioned bodily deformity, physical and mental disease, infancy or old age, and other similar conditions, which may be said to be providential in their origin, and which must prevail to some extent in all states of society. In consequence of the operation of this cause there would always be some needy members of society requiring charity and help, though the operation of every other cause should cease. But the last and by far the most prolific cause of poverty and suffering among men is that *selfish struggle for superiority and advantage*, which still pervades the whole system of social life, even in Christian lands, and which necessarily secures the victory to the stronger and drives the weaker to the wall. It is in consequence of this struggle that some are either unable to obtain suitable employment, or to get fair wages for their labor, or to protect the fruits of their labor against the encroachments of those more powerful and cunning than themselves. Sooner or later these must give up the struggle, and suffer themselves to be crushed between the merciless wheels of the social machine; not because they are morally worse, but because, forsooth, they are physically and intellectually less able than their more successful competitors, or perhaps because the circumstances under which the struggle was begun were against them. It is the operation of this natural law of competition, uncontrolled by the interposition of any higher ethical law, that not only directly robs multitudes of the means of subsistence and reduces them to indigence, but also greatly aggravates the operation of those other causes of destitution which have just been mentioned. Here, then, at the door of society itself, lies the wrong of which the poor are complaining, and from the effects of which the Church is constantly trying to relieve them.

Plato, in the *Gorgias*, represents Kallikles, one of the speakers of the dialogue, as advancing the immoral theory that the superior, the stronger, the more intelligent, have the

natural right of ruling over the inferior, the weaker, the more ignorant, and of depriving these of their goods and using them for the gratification of their own desires. The notion of equality, Kallikles maintains, is only an artificial distinction, established, indeed, by law, but contrary to nature; for nature and law, he says, are for the most part contrary to one another. By *nature* every man has a right to get and to enjoy as much as he *can*, in any way he can, without any regard for the rights of others; and there is nothing wrong or base in the act, if a strong man rob a weaker of his goods; as Hercules, for example, drove away the oxen of Geryon, without either having bought them or obtained them as a present. According to nature, *might is right*, as is apparent from the conduct of the animal world, and of the lowest races of men who live in a state of nature without law. But in human society the multitude, because of their weakness, establish laws for their own protection and benefit, inventing artificial distinctions of right and wrong, and teaching that it is base and unjust for one to obtain a superiority over others, and that to endeavor to acquire more than others is injustice. In this way the most capable are cajoled out of their natural rights. The best and strongest among men are taken from their youth, and subdued and broken, by being taught that it is right, beautiful and just to preserve equality; just as lions are tamed by incantations and juggleries. But the spell is not always effectual. Whenever a man is found with sufficient natural power, he shakes off these trammels, abandons and tramples under foot our written ordinances, and juggleries, and incantations, and laws contrary to nature; and rising up in his might, he shows himself a master; and then the justice of nature shines forth. Kallikles maintains, further, that it is beautiful and just according, to nature, that a man should suffer his desires to be as great as possible, and should not restrain them, but should be able, when at their height, to minister to them by his courage and prudence, and to satisfy each desire as it arises; for "luxury, intemperance,

and liberty, if they have the proper support—that is virtue and felicity.” *

Socrates commends Kallikles for saying thus plainly what others indeed think, but are not willing to say. That, of course, refers to the sentiment of the Greek world in the fourth century B. C.; but how is it with the sentiment, or at least the practice, of our own world in these modern times? Whether we like to say it or not, is it not a fact that this Kalliklean principle is the one which for the most part governs the conduct of men even in Christian society? In trade, in commerce, in politics, in all the diversified forms of business life and activity, is not the rule of action the principle that each one has the natural right to get all that his skill and ingenuity, or his position, may enable him to get, though it may be at the expense of the comfort and even the life of others less able than himself? Is the principle enounced by Kallikles anything else than a clear and naked statement of the great “natural law of competition,” which still prevails and controls in all spheres of human activity? The merchant sells his goods at the highest price he can get, without any regard for the interest of the purchaser. The manufacturer goes into the market and hires laborers at the lowest wages at which he can get them, without any thought of the question whether they and their families shall be able to live or not. The farmer exhausts his ingenuity in the endeavor to get as high a price as possible for the produce of his soil, without any concern for the necessities of those who may be lacking bread. We do not mean to deny that there are exceptions to this statement. There are Christian men who are not unmindful of the sublime ethical principle which requires that one should not look merely to his own interests, but also to the interests of others (Phil. 2: 4), nor of the golden rule, which demands that people should treat others as they would wish themselves to be treated. But this is not the rule on which the business of the world is con-

* “Τρυφή καὶ ἀκολασία καὶ ἐλευθερία, ἐὰν ἐπικουρίαν ἔχῃ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀρετὴ τε καὶ εὐδαιμονία.”

ducted; and about the most that they can do who truly honor this rule, is that they seek to bind up the wounds of those who have been worsted in the cruel battle of life. The economic rule according to which the affairs of the world are conducted is still "the good old plan, that they should get who have the power;" and they who have not the power to get anything, are not fit to live.

This economic rule seems to be a continuation in the moral world of the natural law of the "struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest," which is known to prevail throughout the whole domain of the physical world. Kallikles, in the treatise of Plato above referred to, appeals, in proof of the correctness of his political theory, to the fact that "both among *other animals*, and in whole cities and races of men, the just (*τὸ δίκαιον*) is so judged, that the superior should rule over the inferior, and possess more than they." Kallikles knew nothing of the modern theory of evolution, which regards the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest as one of the necessary and fundamental laws of the universal process of development in the world. Had he known this theory, he might have made his argument much stronger than it is. In the natural world the strongest, the healthiest, the most vigorous plants and animals prevail over the weaker in the struggle for existence which is constantly going on among them; and this, while it may be a hardship to those individuals which perish, is a benefit to the species which is thereby improved. In seasons when food is scarce, the stronger members of a species in the same territory obtain more than the weaker, robbing these of a part of their share of existing provisions. This leaves the weaker still more weak, and less able consequently to escape the attacks of other animals or the severity of the seasons. The less perfect and the less vigorous are thus continually killed off, while the more perfect and vigorous survive and continue the species. The accident of superior physical strength or instinctive cunning determines the individual's advantage in the struggle for life, and every individual pursues

this advantage to the utmost possible extent. There is here nothing like sympathy for other individuals, except the affection of parents for their offspring, which, however, endures only for a short time; there is no consideration for the wants and sufferings of other individuals, no recognition of anything like the altruistic principle of love, which forms the supreme law of the moral and spiritual world. The supreme law of action in the animal world is pure and simple *selfishness*.

But the fact that such is the case in the animal world does not prove that the predominance of the principle of selfishness is the right and proper thing in the human world. In humanity the natural is intended to be transcended, and transfigured into the moral and spiritual. The selfish principle of action, rooted in the physical basis of human existence, is intended, we believe, to be overcome and transformed by the ethical principle of love, just referred to; somewhat as the chemical laws of matter, though not violated, are held in suspension by the principle of vitality in a living organism. Here, we think, it is necessary for the moralist to part company with the mere evolutionist. Human society, like the human individual, is a complex organization, involving ethical as well as physical elements and forces; in which the ethical constituents are not intended to be swallowed up of the physical, but rather to rule over them. Human conduct is not intended to be determined by the natural principle or blind instinct of selfishness, but by reason and conscience, by conceptions of right and emotions of love, which respect the welfare and happiness of other human beings as well as of self. Human individuals, however imperfect and weak they may be, are not destined, like animals, to be specimens merely of the race, whom the more perfect and strong have a right to kill off, or use for their own convenience and pleasure, as they may choose; but moral personalities, reflecting, each in a peculiar way, the image of God, possessing each an infinite value, as a distinct realization of an eternal thought of God, and being invested, therefore, with the inalien-

able right of life, liberty and happiness on equal terms with the more powerful.

Such, no doubt, is the divine idea of humanity; but this idea has never yet been fully realized in human society. In the actual working of human life the natural principle has always to a large extent swallowed up the ethical, or at least domineered over it; a proof that humanity has not yet attained unto its ideal or *truly human* state. It is not the law of love, but the law of competition, whose very essence is selfishness, that forms the ruling principle in all the business of social life. And under the operation of this law, the stronger or the more favored individual must as inevitably prevail over the weaker or the less favored, as the more vigorous animal prevails over the less vigorous in the struggle for existence. Mere crude physical force has, indeed, been to some extent bridled by the ethical sentiment of society, expressing itself in its institutions and laws. The Samsons and Herculeses of society may not be permitted to use their whole physical strength to the disadvantage of their weaker fellows; though Kallikles would say that this is a subversion of the laws of nature, and a violation of natural right. But while mere physical strength is thus put under some sort of restraint, there is no such restraint put upon intellectual strength. This, if not balanced by the presence and action of the moral principle in the soul, is free to pursue its advantage to the utmost extent of its ability. The possession of intellectual power, of the capacity for craft and cunning, or of wealth and fortune, gives the lucky possessor an advantage over his less able or less fortunate brethren, in the struggle of life, which must invariably determine the issue of the struggle in his favor. Society has, indeed, invented laws to protect its members against violence and injustice, and against robbery and fraud, and similar crimes; but it is well known how ineffectual these are to protect the feeble against the violence of the strong, or the more artless and simple against the injustice of the more cunning and crafty, and what wrongs are at times committed in the very name and

under the very forms of law itself! It is plain, then, that in the present organization of society, under the operation of the simple law of competition, the stronger and abler competitors must gain the victory over the weaker and less able, without any regard to the moral character of either. Indeed, the victors will perhaps generally be those who are morally the basest, and, therefore, the least worthy of surviving. The superior are not those who in the moral sense are the noblest and best men, but simply those who start in life either with the natural advantage of enhanced physical and intellectual strength and energy, or with the accidental advantage of high birth and fortune, of inherited rank and wealth, or with both these advantages combined. These are the successful competitors in the struggle for gain. They secure more of the good things of this life than those who are less favored by nature, and at their expense. They live largely upon the labor of the weak, and prevent these from fully enjoying the fruits of their own toil. The natural result of this economic struggle perpetually going on in society, is a continual increase of wealth and luxury and a corresponding increase of poverty and misery in the same community. The progress of civilization among different nations has always run this course; so that it has come to be an accepted truism that the accumulation of great wealth among a people implies the existence of much poverty among the same people, and a high degree of civilization a corresponding degree of degradation. Great cities, like Babylon and Rome in ancient times, and London, Paris and New York in our own day, afford abundant illustrations of this fact. The few, the strong, those whom the possession of capital and shrewdness have made strong, take advantage of the many, accumulate wealth, and live in ease and luxury, while the many sink into poverty and wretchedness; and this goes on until the Nemesis of the outraged law of humanity avenges herself by the fall and destruction of the social system, in which both rich and poor perish together. This is the secret of the fall of empires.

It is a well-known fact that the increase of national wealth merely is not sufficient to make a people strong, prosperous and happy. Rome was never richer and never more wretched than in the time of Nero; when all the earth was pouring her treasures into the lap of her imperial mistress; when out of a population of twelve hundred thousand, scarcely two thousand were proprietors, the balance being slaves, dependents and beggars; when a noble senator could waste four hundred thousand sesterces upon a single banquet, at the same time that hundreds of thousands of Roman citizens were pinched from want of bread; and when one Roman lady could wear a robe studded with pearls and emeralds, costing forty million sesterces, while thousands of Italian women were shivering in the cold of winter clad in a simple tunic. What is required in order to the happiness of a people, and the safety of the social system, is not merely the accumulation of national wealth, but also a fair and equitable distribution of it. We are, in this country, in the habit of boasting of our national wealth and greatness. We point with patriotic pride to the enormous extent of our public works, to our great systems of railroads and telegraphs, to our vast manufacturing institutions, to our great cities with their immense warehouses, and stores, and shops and the like. But we forget that all this wealth is rapidly coming into the hands, or at least under the control, of a few hundreds of millionaires, who are ostentatiously using it for the gratification of their own vanity and selfish desires; while the masses of the people, especially the laboring people, are becoming relatively poorer every day, and less able to meet the wants of life in a civilized community.* And how do these lords of

* To the assertion that the working people are becoming poorer, the answer is often made, that they receive better wages now, and are able to live better, than was the case at some time in the past, say, for instance, the time of Elizabeth, or of the Stuarts, in England. That may be true; but that does not prove that, relatively to the condition of other classes, they are as well off now as they were then. Civilization has much advanced since then; and the advancement of civilization brings new wants. Now what we say, and what we think cannot be successfully

Mammon manage to get possession of all this wealth? Are their services worth all this to the world? No, that cannot be pretended. They are reaping the fruits not merely of their own labor and trouble, but they are getting the advantages also of the sweat and toil of thousands of others, to which they are not entitled by any principle of right and justice.* Those palatial residences of railroad kings, and merchant princes, and manufacturing moguls, and political bosses, rivaling in grandeur the palaces of Oriental monarchs, mean poor and insufficient pay to the multitudes of laborers who do the world's hard work. And poor pay to the workingmen means thousands of them crowded into small and unhealthy tenement houses, breathing impure air, wearing insufficient clothing, and living on insufficient or unwholesome food. And that, again, means disease, mental and physical weakness, intemperance, vice and crime, not only in parents, but also in generations of their offspring.

No doubt poverty is at times a punishment for personal sins. Some people are poor through their own fault. They are either lazy, or extravagant, or intemperate in their habits, and destitution is the natural consequence of their immoral conduct. But are there not those also who are rich in consequence of their own iniquity? Is not wealth often the fruit of dishonesty, of injustice, of extortion? If, then, there may at times be sin in poverty, so also is there often sin in the possession of wealth; and this, as we have just seen, is not unfrequently the cause of

contradicted, is that working people are not as well able to meet the wants of civilized life now as they were in the past. They are *relatively* poorer, and, therefore, of course, less *contented*.

* We are not ignorant of the *difficulty* of determining *fairly* in all cases the value of a man's work; nor do we forget that there is a difference in the *quality* of work, so that one man's labor may be worth a great deal more than another's. But when an employer of labor has an income of thirty dollars a day as the reward of his trouble, and a profit of twenty per cent. on the capital invested in his business, while his employees receive one dollar and fifty cents a day, and work hard, then one need have no hesitation to say that things are not *fair*.

poverty and of sin in others. We are accustomed to hearing *intemperance* treated as one of the main causes of poverty and want. And, of course, it must be conceded that a vast amount of the destitution in the world may be traced directly or indirectly to this cause. But how much of the existing intemperance again may have its cause in antecedent poverty and privation? No doubt, if an accurate inquiry could be instituted on this point, the result would be astonishing. The physiology of the appetite for alcoholic beverages, as well as the desire for tobacco and other stimulants, is now pretty well understood. It is well-known that this appetite is often the result of a low power of digestion, of diminished vitality, or of nervous exhaustion, owing to an insufficient supply of wholesome food, to over-work, to want of rest, and to similar causes. The use of alcoholic drinks, by diminishing the waste of tissue in the system, will enable a man, for a time, to do with less food than he would otherwise need;* and there is reason to believe that they are far more frequently resorted to from this cause than from mere wilful perversity. Now, when the under-paid operatives of a great factory, whose nerves have been jarred all day by the whirring of machinery, and whose dinner has been made of cold potato and a slice of bread, seek to supply the deficiency by indulging in beer and gin, who is responsible for their intemperance? And then, when they fall a prey to disease, and sink into premature graves, who is responsible for that? And again, when their children, who are always ill-fed and ill-clad, and brought up in close and musty cellars or cold garrets, become intemperate likewise, and perchance vicious and criminal, who is responsible for that? Here probably we shall find the cause of the enormous increase of intemperance and vice in recent years, especially in large cities and manufacturing and mining regions, notwithstanding the most determined efforts and labors of the friends of temperance.† The

* See *Carpenter's Human Pysiology*, Philadelphia, 1860, p. 79.

† The increase of intemperance in this country, like some other unpleasant things, is sometimes set to the account of the foreign immigration. It

people who make up the great army of drunkards, and paupers and criminals, marching to premature and inglorious graves, are not any worse by nature, nor have they any more sins upon their souls, than many of those fine people who live in grand houses, dress elegantly, and fare sumptuously every day; they are, at least many of them, only people who have failed in the struggle for existence, and are, therefore, dying off and making room for others, as it is their bounden duty to do, being less fit to live than their luckier brothers.

And now, what has the Church, and what has Christian society to say to these things? The Church might say that the wrong of which the poor are complaining, and on account of which socialistic agitators are heaping reproaches upon all Christian institutions, is not the fruit of her teaching. She teaches men to love their neighbors as themselves, and to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. To this, however, it might be replied that many of her most prominent and influential members do not follow her teaching in this regard, but that they extort the very money which they lay upon her altars out of the unpaid labor of the poor. But the Church might say, further, that she feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, nurses the sick, gives herself an infinite amount of trouble to reform the vicious, and, in a word, spends vast sums of money in the way of charity to the poor. This, however, it might be answered again, does not meet the case. What the poor require is not charity, but justice. The world owes every man a fair chance to make an honest living for himself. Give a man a chance to help himself, and to supply his wants by his own effort, and you do a great deal more for him than by giving him alms. To beat a man in the battle of life, and utterly overthrow him, because you are a little

appears, however, that during the period from 1876 to 1883 the increase of the consumption of distilled liquors was $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., that of malt liquors $51\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and that of vinous liquors $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while the total increase of the population during the same period was only about 12 per cent. See *Hom. Rev.*, February, 1885, p. 182.

stronger and shrewder than he, is an injury to his manhood for which you cannot make amends by afterwards maintaining him at your expense. If, knowing your own strength and his weakness, you had given him a chance, in the struggle for gain, to get a little something too, you would have done him a good that might have been the making of him as a man; but your alms will probably quench the last spark of manhood in him, and he will likely be a pauper, and perhaps a criminal, all the rest of his days. And as for your efforts to rescue the fallen, and to reform the vicious and the criminal, your worry about the management of prisons, and so on, these would have been of far more account if they had been expended a little earlier, and directed to the removal of those causes in the social body which tend so strongly to make men vicious and criminal. It is well, of course, that these things are done; well that the poor are looked after; well that the widow and orphan are cared for, though it be done sometimes with the very money that was unrighteously withheld from the husband and father; well that the outcast and criminal are not forgotten. But this is after all only treating the effects or symptoms of a disease in the social organism, and not penetrating to the root of the disease itself; and it is, therefore, a mere Sisyphus work, that never stays done when it is done.

Has Christianity no remedy for the radical evil itself? Must the Church say to the thousands who, through no *moral fault* of their own, go to the wall in the struggle of life, "There is no help for you but in the grave?" Shall those who are smarting under a sense of oppression and wrong, be told that the world is hopelessly bad, and that there is nothing better for them to do than meekly to submit to injustice here, and to wait patiently for the judgment to come, when their wrongs shall be redressed? We do not think that that is the spirit of Christianity; and we are sure that such comfort would not satisfy the aspirations and desires of the human heart. All men desire to better their condition in this world; and a religion or creed that should have no promises for this life

would not meet their approbation or find acceptance with them. But Christianity, while it has glorious promises for the life which is to come, teaching men to hope for complete blessedness after the sorrows of this life are ended, and to look for a righteous judgment hereafter, when the inequalities and wrongs of time shall be avenged—Christianity has promises also for the life which now is. It is intended to make this world better, and human life here more cheerful and happy, as well as to prepare men for the world to come. And to tell those who are oppressed and wronged, that they ought not to desire any better condition here, but to be satisfied with the prospect of seeing their tormentors tormented hereafter, while they shall be comforted, would not be to speak in the spirit of Christianity. We believe that it is the aim of Christianity to bring about a condition of the world in which there shall be neither tormentors nor tormented, and that there will be a time when righteousness shall dwell in the earth. We believe that it is the aim of Christianity to regenerate and sanctify the world's entire life and activity, its industry, its trade, its commerce, its science, its art and its politics. If the parable of the mustard seed is a prophecy of the *extensive* universality which necessarily belongs to Christianity as the absolute religion of humanity, so also the parable of the leaven is a prophecy of its *intensive* universality; and it will not have fulfilled its mission in the world until the whole lump shall have been leavened,—that is, until the entire life of humanity shall have been pervaded and animated by its spirit. And when that point shall have been reached even approximately only (for more than that may perhaps not be expected during the process of the world's development), then oppression and wrong will no longer exist, the contest between capital and labor will have ceased, and "liberty, fraternity and equality" will no longer be an empty phrase.

But how shall that point be reached? In other words, how shall the great problem of social economy, now pressing for solution, be met and solved? We do not now propose to

attempt a solution of the problem, by presenting a scheme for the reconstruction of the social organism and prescribing rules for its conduct. For such a task we claim no ability; and our aim in this paper has been the humbler one of showing simply that the problem exists and demands attention. We venture now simply to state a few general principles in the way of conclusion. And, first, we would say that the problem cannot be solved by the abolition of the law of private property, and a resort to communism. That idea is an idle dream that can never be realized. Whenever this plan has been tried, even on the smallest scale, it has speedily ended in ignominious failure. Perhaps it might be said that these failures have been due to the fact that humanity was not yet sufficiently advanced in an intellectual and moral regard, for such an experiment. We believe, however, on the contrary, that they are due to a degree of advancement that was rather too high than too low. In point of fact, a state of barbarism seems to be more favorable to the realization of the idea of communism than a state of advanced moral and intellectual development. Among savages there exists but little private property, but as civilization advances the amount increases. Property is the product of labor; and that the laborer should have the exclusive ownership of the product of his labor, would seem to be an ethical axiom. And it is certainly an essential condition of industrial and social progress. The state of the primitive church in Jerusalem is sometimes referred to as an example of communism. But if it was such, it was at least not of that radical kind which has been advocated by some social philosophers in modern times. In fact, however, it was no communism at all, or at least no abolition of private property. It is simply related that "not one of them *said* that aught of the things which he *possessed* was his *own*;" but that implies that the right of possession was not surrendered. All were willing to make sacrifices of any amount of their private possessions, in order to be able to assist any of their brethren who were in need; but that is something different from the communism which would

abolish all private ownership of property, and give to every member of society the right of enjoying the fruit of every other member's labor. This would, in fact, be the same injustice over again of which so many are complaining now: namely, the injustice of not being permitted to reap to the full extent the fruit of their own labor.

Nor can the problem under consideration be solved by the external intervention of the state in the social economy of its citizens. We do not believe, indeed, that the science of legislation and of government is yet finished; on the contrary, we look for progress here beyond anything that has yet been attained. And we are ready to believe, therefore, that the state may hereafter exercise functions for the common weal of which at present we have no ideas at all. For instance, the state may limit, or break up, the power of injurious monopolies; it may suppress gambling in bread-stuffs, and other forms of merchandise, as it has already suppressed lotteries; it may prohibit the employment of children under a certain age in factories, and insist upon their being sent to school during a certain portion of their time; and it may perhaps render other important services to the cause of righteousness and humanity, of which we cannot now think. But the state can never, by statute, regulate the price of labor, or grain, or merchandise. It can never, by any system of police regulations, wholly prevent the more powerful and crafty of its citizens from taking advantage of the weaker and less intelligent. It cannot secure to all strict and equal justice. But it can be fair and just to all, so far as its own agency is concerned. It can, and ought to be, impartial and just in its own administration of law, and, so far at least as this goes, give to all its citizens an equal chance in the struggle of life. No civilized state ought to discriminate against any class or number of its citizens, and especially against the poorer, in the way of unequal or burdensome taxation, or class legislation. This it does, for instance, when it derives revenue from the poor man's coffee, and sugar, and clothes, and exempts from taxation the bonds and mort-

gages of the millionaire. That is an abuse of power and a crime that ought not to be tolerated for a day in any civilized government. Thus then, while the state cannot do everything that is required to make its people happy, and while it probably goes too far when it undertakes to regulate private industries, as, for instance, by means of protective tariffs, it can yet do much to give all an equal chance for happiness.

But the problem of sound social economy can only be satisfactorily solved on the basis of the Christian Church and of the ethical principles of the Gospel of Christ. When the ethical principle of love, laid down in the Gospel, shall have taken the place of the natural principle of selfishness in the conduct of human affairs, then there will no longer be occasion to complain of social wrong. When men shall love their neighbor as themselves, and look not each only to his own things, but also to the things of others, then the strong will no longer oppress the weak; but, on the contrary, the weak and the strong will exist for each other, will bear each other's burdens, and mutually minister to each other's happiness. Could not the affairs of the world be conducted on this principle of love, as well as on the principle of selfishness? Would the march of enterprise stop, and the wheels of industry cease to revolve, if once this principle were universally recognized and acted on among men? Could not men labor as faithfully and be as diligent in business when inspired by the fear of God and the love of men, as when animated merely by the selfish desire of gain? But the acceptance of this principle, and the recognition of it in the practical affairs of life, cannot be forced, but must be a matter of freedom. Love is free, and can not be enforced by any external authority or power. The Church cannot *compel* men to love each other, to recognize the value of each other's personality, and to desire and seek each other's welfare; and she cannot compel them to conduct their affairs on this principle. But she can hold it forth as an ideal, and proclaim it as a duty. In her pulpits, in her seats of learning, in her periodicals and journals, she can so emphasize it, that it

may take hold of the life and consciences of men, and at last mould the ethical sentiment of society. If she be faithful to her trust, the Church may at last so influence social sentiment, that an unjust or selfish man, who for selfish ends would take advantage of others less able than himself, shall become as odious in the eyes of all decent people, as the big-bodied bully would be, who should walk down street and trample to death all the children he might happen to meet, because he is stronger than they. And the Church is committed, by the very charter of her existence, to this principle of love and fair dealing. However inefficiently she may at times have preached it, it is still a part of her fundamental law, and she can never wholly forget it without becoming false to her whole being. Those laboring men, therefore, who are abusing the Church, and seeking to break down her influence, are striking at their own best friend. The Church may not always have done her duty to the down-trodden and the oppressed; she may at times have been too partial to those possessing wealth and power, and her ministers may have been too fond of basking in the sunshine of greatness. But even supposing this to be the case, where have the oppressed and the weak a *better* friend on earth than in the Church? Whatever her shortcomings may be, she teaches at least that every man, whatever his condition may be, is a child of God, a being of infinite value, loved of God, possessing rights that must be respected, and that God will respect if men do not. What does atheistic philosophy teach on this subject? We have an answer to this question in the theory of Kallikles presented above.

III.

THE PROGRESS OF MODERN UNBELIEF.

Second Article.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, D.D.

It will be remembered that Mr. Mill's quotation assumes all religions to be "products thrown up by certain states of civilization." Accordingly, they are not to be discussed either as intrinsically true or false in themselves. Mr. Footman confesses to an experience of real oppression in consequence of the plausibility with which the learned scientist clothes his argument. He thinks, too, that every thinking clergyman must realize some difficulty, occasioned by the influence which the lucid tone of the argument wears, whenever the minister would lay the claims of foreign missions before a people. Nor is it to be denied that its tendency has kept back a large number of persons in the church from an active interest in missions, and seriously affects the income of missionary societies. It is another evidence of the fact that modern unbelief is no longer confined to speculative and metaphysical minds, but that it has come down to the masses in such force as to hinder the operations of practical church work in the minds of practical people. Our author illustrates the extent of this evil tendency by an anecdote.

A sedate commoner was asked what he thought of baptismal regeneration. The reply was: "A very good thing in its way."

What this man felt about a particular doctrine very many think about the whole Christian faith. They believe Christianity to be a very good religion "in its way." They think the same, however, of all other religious systems. Why, then, "worry savages," or attempt to convert Mahommedans or Budd-

hists to Christianity? Their own religion, we are told, is surely so much better suited for them than ours. Christianity (it is alleged) is what it is by reason of a long train of antecedent circumstances, extending through ages behind us, of which circumstances, together with the present environment, it is really the product. And these assertions apply to all other religions. Given the observed phenomena of individual organisms, studied under the guide of the biologist, and the verified results of the scientific historical method, under the guidance of sociology, and we can trace all religions, Christianity included, to a perfectly natural source, it is claimed. All religions are very much alike, accordingly. They all have legends, cosmogonies, moral maxims, rewards and punishments; they all stand in some relation, more or less harmonious, to the consciousness of the masses, and only so long as they do not cease to bear a strong family likeness can they survive. As soon as this ceases, do they gradually lose their hold upon the age, unless, indeed, the masters of the mysteries are sufficiently dexterous in bringing them into some sort of at least apparent harmony with that consciousness, in which case they obtain a new lease of life. The earnest believer, it is conceded, does not see this, because he is an enthusiast, a one-sided partisan, and only believes so long as he is enthusiastic. He is firmly persuaded of the reality of the object of his faith, certainly, but so are all other religionists, we are still told, and so nothing is proved as to the real objective existence of any corresponding object, either in our case or in that of others. It is boldly maintained that there is no such object in *rerum natura*, as that on which the Christian fastens his faith. The only thing of which invulnerable proof seems to be afforded, is that of a wide-spread and almost irresistible tendency of the human mind to reach out towards the infinite, and to aspire to commune with some unknown and unknowable absolute being.

Mr. Footman has no doubt that these feelings are becoming more general than the clergy have yet realized them to be, and that they have a large audience, over which a very potent in-

fluence is exerted, touching the ways men have of looking at the Christian religion. Therefore he feels prompted to ask the questions : How are we to deal with these feelings ? How are we to meet these deep and powerful feelings ? This deep and powerful stream of tendency ?

He would have us, first of all, to emphasize the truth of that wide-spread and ineradicable sense in the human mind of the need of communion with an infinite, or, at least, supernatural being.

His second position is that Christians must see that it is *not* to the interest of Christianity at all to pour any ridicule or contempt upon "other religions;" or to depreciate the value of any truth or beauty which may be found latent or expressed in any doctrine or myth of the Brahmin, the Buddhist, the Mahomedan, or in the savages' religions; or that can be traced in the exploded mythologies of the defunct religious systems of antiquity. All light is from the Source of Light. Our Lord is not to be looked upon as the founder of a rival religion, but "as the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The light was made manifest in Him, but was not *created* by Him among mankind. He was in the world, in the hearts of men, although they knew Him not. He is still working in men now, although they know him not yet, and have never yet recognized His voice as that of the Word of God. If the clergy take any narrower view of the Person of Christ and of His work, as having shed no light beyond the pale of Christendom, or as having stirred no yearnings after goodness and glory, save in the minds of those who are consciously to themselves under His inspiring illumination, and consciously to themselves the objects of His eternal charity. If we believed our Lord to be *less* than He really is; if we narrowed our conception of Him so that we only regarded Him as a great teacher, who was murdered eighteen hundred years ago, and whose name afterwards was used by His followers as forming an excellent foundation for one more new religion; and if we had attached ourselves to this religion, and felt towards it as

we might towards a favorite party or cherished sect, *then*, indeed, we might be suspected of being conscientiously bigoted in proportion as we were conscientiously Christian. But to take the New Testament conception of Christ, and realize what is meant by the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, by the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, by the Epistle to the Hebrews, by St. Paul's sermon at Athens, by the whole book—we then see whether, together with that burning desire to proclaim His Name to mankind, there must not also be in the mind of a servant of Christ a delighted readiness to welcome every good and beautiful thought, every maxim of justice, of purity, or of pity, every effort to bring about a peaceful, although costly reconciliation of man with his Maker, and every dream of such a reconciliation of which he may find any record or traces in any of the religions of the world, and not only to welcome them, but to own them as signs that the word of God has not left Himself without a witness anywhere, and that he is present to prepare the hearts of men to lay hold on the news, on the Gospel, which they are anxious to hear, and which we believe they all want.

The assertion, again, that the Christian creed, like all other creeds, is a product thrown up by certain states of civilization, and that it represents the natural growth of the human mind in particular stages of its career, and that it is destined to give way to other creeds as mankind becomes enlightened, or possibly (although this is not quite certain) to no creed as mankind, becomes perfectly illuminated, so that we may see all things in the clear light and with the dry eye of science, when this atmosphere is felt around us—how can we best meet it so as to *satisfy* rather than *repress* it? How shall we proceed? What line of argument do we propose to adopt? We must reply that the very principle which lies at the bottom of this scientific method of thinking has ever been regarded as *fundamental* in the Christian schools. Consequently the Living Word of God was manifested in "THE FULLNESS OF TIME." There was no infraction of any law, no arbitrary interference with that order

of things, no change of mind on the part of God, which the Incarnation involved. The way had been preparing for ages, and whispers of what was coming had been overheard in every clime. Fables of incarnations, expectations of incarnations, dreams and legends of deliverers of men, the thirst for some sign that the Eternal was in communion with men, or that he could be put into communion with them by sacrifice or by pain of death, the ineradicable tendency of the human mind to feel after a God, to make for itself a God in human shape and arrayed in the attributes of human beauty, as with the Orientals, to lose the human in the Divine—*these*, no less than the prophetic declarations of the seers of Israel; *these*, no less than the long and painful preparation and education of the chosen race, were all really prelude of the Incarnation of the Divine and Eternal Word. That there were myths, legends, phantasies of the human mind, springing out of human misery and human hope, and that many of these remind us as they confront us of the Christian doctrine—this does not at all suggest the reasonableness of *dismissing* the Christian doctrine into the region of the unreal or fantastic. The Biblical teaching of the UNITY of the human race in every clime, age and stage of civilization might verily lead us to look for just such indications of *unity of legends and phantasies*. Welcome all these indications of the anxiety of mankind to find some relief from pain and the sorrow of sin, for some answer to their cry to heaven, for signs of sympathy and response from above! Welcome all these obstinate struggles of the human race to assert its relationship to the one Supreme Ruler and Sustainer of men! Welcome these proofs that men have never been able to rest for long in the lower region of mere sense and phenomena! "God was speaking in many countries, by divers manners through these unconscious prophets of the heathen world; God, we say, Who has now spoken to us by His Son, by Whom also He made the worlds, had never left Himself without a witness."

This is Mr. Footman's clear answer to the scientist's theory of the "survival of Christianity."

Even the men of *no religion* are given to utterances which our author turns to weighty arguments for the truths of the Christian creed. The shocking declaration of Professor Clifford, who shook off his "cradle faith," betrays the human need of finding somehow a *Theanthropism*, or an unconscious homage to the Incarnation. He asks to see our "Father *Man*," which means that the help is not to come *outside humanity*.

The cynical sayings of the pessimist are handled with great power and to very splendid advantage. Mr. Footman assures us that no man could have "felt the horror of such moments more deeply than" he had, or have come nearer to the very jaws of despair.

The Gospel of Christ became here the "power of God unto salvation" again, and he is very sure that the Gospel is the only means of convincing us of the coming of a time when it shall be made manifest that "the sufferings of this present season are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." Hence, he thanks the pessimist for forcing upon us anew the conviction of what an awful thing it is to live. The grim inequalities of nature, the deadly struggles, the blood-stained battle-fields, the cruel, crushing forces of wrong and lust, through which others had to make their way to liberty and social order or to true manhood—all these can only be tolerated on the ground of that hope which our creed affords. He thanks all who in any wise enable one to see that this world is not a mere "play-ground," no holiday spectacle, but an arena of real conflict, in which it is shame and ruin for man to trifle. With the Gospel before us, we may not only sympathize with all the suffering men and women, but look the worst in the face and hope for the deliverance of that Father who sees the sparrow fall to the ground, and who is not unconcerned in the suffering family of man. His Gospel brings us patience, prevents us from lethargy, makes us bold to labor, puts value on the humblest of mortals, throws a gleam of glory upon a sick-bed, and enables us to hear the saddest stories of triumphant weakness or of wrong, and yet feel certain that evil will not triumph

in the end, since by the honorable way of sacrifice the day of a higher inheritance must dawn, through Him who became the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world. Whoever reads these pages will become afresh convinced that it was not left for the pessimist to reveal the sad effects of the fall. All that he can do is to repeat what has been persistently taught by prophet and apostle, but without the hope set before us.

The Christian thinker will be especially gratified with Mr. Footman's essay on CRITICISM, and the pressing need of a studious class among the clergy, that can cope with Renan, Strauss, and those relentless German critics; and more particularly with such popular lecturers and missionaries as Mr. Forster and Mrs. Besant. Again he retails the bold words of that feminine athlete:—"The difficulty is not to prove that Christ was believed to be an historical personage after the fourth century, but to bridge over the years between A.D.1-300; you cannot carry the history of Christ and the history of the Gospel over that terrible chasm of three centuries." He maintains that we are given an expression of an opinion which is held by many of the working classes, and which is being used with considerable effect. It is for the pulpit man as well as for the professor to meet it. He rejoices over the announcement that the "Date and Credibility of the Gospels" is to be the subject of one of the forthcoming *Present Day Papers* of the Religious Tract Society. Meanwhile, he declares that there are a good many "bridges" by which this chasm by Mrs. Besant may be crossed, which even she would be willing to cross, were it not for the fact that the Christ of the Gospels is so obnoxious to her, as a foregone conclusion. The assumption that the *miraculous* must be excluded from historical ground is for her the Mordecai sitting at the king's gate.

BRIDGE No. 1, Mr. Footman builds of the EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. These, he contends, constitute an independent, primitive witness to the original supernatural character of the Christ of history. Dean Stanley's sermon, appended to his "Epistle to the Corinthians," first forced upon our author's

attention the weight of this argument. It is therein asserted that if we had, up to this time, been readers of the Epistles only, and had now for the first time become acquainted with the Gospel narratives, we should be constrained to say: "We have found Him of Whom Paul in his Epistles wrote." This suggestion is a theme on which he wishes the clergy, each one for himself, to dwell and satisfy themselves. On the strength of it, he assures us, he has been enabled to feel, and make others to feel, that the Christ we worship is not a mythical personage, but the Christ of history. Another popular work Mr. Footman directs attention to, and wishes the clergy to carefully study: "The Historical Christ of St. Paul," by Dr. C. Matheson. He judges it a most important contribution to Christian evidences, from which he would have every preacher to draw Sunday after Sunday, for a congregation in which a large infusion of thoughtful and educated men is found, in order to prepare them for the ultimate acceptance of his conclusions. He denies that there would be any danger whatever of disturbing unnecessarily or injuriously the minds of the less thoughtful members of the church. He would have reference made to the destructive criticism, or to the mythical theories, or to the modern scientific disinclination to accept miracles as historical, for the reason that the minds of men of the world, to say nothing of thoughtful students, are perfectly familiar, at second-hand, if not at first-hand, with these phenomena of the thought of the present day. The very air is full of them, and voices itself in the light literature of the fashionable philosophical articles and critiques in current magazines and reviews. He is convinced of the fact that the lay mind is much better acquainted with the negative or *destructive* side of the critical argument than the clergy are apt to imagine. But as the laity are not so well read on the constructive side, that want should be brought to them, either in books or sermons. Again and again he affirms that this is a duty and a privilege afforded to the clergy of the present generation. And with this incumbent

task discharged, what is the result of this revived effort to get behind the Four Gospels?

The Epistles of St. Paul will then become valuable, as *independent corroborative testimonials to the historical reality of the Christ of the Creeds*. After indicating in mere outline the method of treating them in this light, he is very sure that we shall arrive at the conclusion which Polycarp draws for the Philippians: "The blessed and glorious Paul wrote letters to you, into which, if ye look diligently, ye will be able to be built up to the fulness of the faith given to you." He pithily says: "What we want is a FIFTH GOSPEL: some independent yet trustworthy evidence of the primitive historic conception of Jesus." With what fresh flavor will not these Epistles (especially the four,—Romans, I. and II. Corinthians and Galatians, which have escaped the scythe of the most jealous and sceptical criticism) be indwelled, as furnishing us that Fifth Gospel. Bound up as these now are within the same boards with our Four Gospels, they are yet a distinct and an original source of information, having all the charm and all the authority of documents of an earlier date of composition than any one, perhaps, of the received Gospels themselves,—at any rate, when considered in their present form. These Epistles bring us back to within *twenty-five or thirty years*, at the furthest, of the Crucifixion; besides their epistolary form gives us the advantage of an "undesignedness," to which Paley calls attention when dealing with them, as corroborative of the history of the Acts of the Apostles. Here is an unconscious testimony, which springs incidentally forth, all the more convincing because many of us have not been prepared to look at these Pauline letters in this light. If we may not gather much detailed history, we shall find a history underlying the numerous allusions, exhortations, familiar greetings, all of which imply a perfect familiarity on the part of his correspondents. The burning question is:—What is this underlying history in the Pauline Epistles? It will become manifest that its essential features are fully like the Gospel characteristics. If we had no other source than the Gospels from which

to draw our portrait of Him, or from which to elaborate our conception of His nature and our doctrine of His person than from these Epistles, what conception would we be forced to cherish of Jesus Christ? Would that be like or unlike to the figure which we find formed for us in the Four Gospels? It becomes at once apparent that the Christ of the Four Gospels is none other than the Christ of St. Paul's Epistles. The conviction then is forced upon us that He who is portrayed for us in the Gospels cannot be a mythical character, not a personage that floated about as mist and cloud until He became finally crystallized in the Gospel Jesus of Nazareth. Thus the mythical theory of Christ at once crumbles in dust. With the Four Gospels closed, and with but the Pauline Epistles to read, we learn:—In the fulness of time the Son of God came forth, born of a woman, clothed in Human nature, a lineal descendant of David. His Messiahship is assumed and taught from the outstart, and not accredited as an after-thing; making His advent in poverty and humiliation, and a Man of Sorrows; circumcised, or "made under the law;" conforming to the ordinances of the entire Jewish ceremonial law, and coming forth at his mature manhood, at His thirtieth year, according to the fixed age of His day and people. All this we gather apart from the Gospel records, and yet so like all which they deliver. After we read beyond the Pauline "Gospel of Christ's Infancy" we learn that Jesus made the marvellous impression of a sinless personage on the minds of His disciples and cotemporaries (II. Cor. v. 21). "He knew no sin." This was a tremendous claim for the Jew, in whose mind the thought of sinlessness was associated with Jehovah. And this feature, too, was manifest in Him, and is referred to as a thing never disputed, and not as an after-thought.

The easy manner after which St. Paul treats of the propitiatory character of Christ (Romans III.), immediately, too, in the wake of declaring that "all have sinned," forbids the thought of a Christ different from Him whom the Gospels present. The belief current among Christians, in the lifetime of the Apostles,

as to the nature and person of Jesus of Nazareth, must clearly have been held prior to the date of these Epistles, or St. Paul would not have been content to but allude to, and to assume all along, the fact of His sinlessness and propitiation. And does not this fact help us out of the mythical theory?

Yet more; St. Paul speaks of the Holy Communion, in Christ's own words, as a support to the awful claim made for Him by His early disciples. From the XI. Chapter in I. Corinthians no one can persuade himself that this high honor was thrust upon Him; at a later day, and by the overwrought imaginations of His followers. This is the earliest written account of the institution of the Holy Communion, but it is plain that it could not have been the first time in which the detailed history of it had reached the ears of His followers at Corinth, from the familiar allusions of Paul as to its time of institution, and as to its central point. He is not telling them "Jesus was betrayed," and betrayed in the night. This is mentioned, "by the way," as a matter well known. Does this look like a "myth?"

He goes on and speaks in like familiar terms, of "this cup" as "the new covenant in my blood." Who does not know that the "covenant" was the most awful thing that could be named for the Jew? It expressed for him the whole secret of the relation between God and man. And still St. Paul writes about this solemn matter, as of a fact conceded and undisputed from the time of its founding. He is actually *worshipped* from the beginning, as no Jew could have been willing to worship a being but Jehovah. This is plain from the greeting to the Corinthians: "with all that call upon the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place." What to "call upon the name of the Lord" meant to a Jew, we need not ask long.

To be sure, such worship, even though it was accorded to Him from the earliest dawn, does not prove that it was not an *idolatry*. But that objection is not now our concern. The point the author makes is: "That this worship of Christ was so common among them, twenty-five years after His crucifixion,

that it is alluded to then by St. Paul in a letter, acknowledged to be genuine, as something well known, and which excited no wonder, and must consequently have been in vogue all along."

So far His person, it must be confessed, emerges from the Pauline letters in perfect resemblance to the Christ of the Gospels. And the same light may be gathered concerning His teaching. We learn therein that He claimed to be the Messiah, the King of Kings, and yet after such a manner as not to have thought to erect a *rival* of Cæsar's. Righteousness and peace were to be its marks. But this was but the thought of the Gospel: "Render therefore unto God the things that are God's; and unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Place this aside of (Rom. xiii.): "Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor." If St. Paul had brought forth a thought of his own, and had not had the precept of the Lord before himself, he would have said, as he did on the subject of marriage: "I, not the Lord," etc. (I. Cor. viii. 2).

Nor could St. Paul have written the 12th and 13th Chapters in Romans, when he talks of love as the fulfilling of the law, or the wonderful xiiiith Chapter in I. Corinthians, had he not been merely holding up to their minds Christ's Sermon on the Mount, as something known so well and heartily as not to need a different style in the least.

Enough is seen already to convince us that the Jesus of the Gospels is not a mythical crystallization of the second or third centuries. The thickness of allusions, of statements, of exhortations, and of assumptions, drive us to the conclusion that the historical Christ was believed in from the first age, as He was later accepted by the Christian Church, as one grand miracle.

But we are led on still further, by our author, in drawing the resemblance between the Christ of the Gospels and the Christ of the Epistles.

Gospel: "I am the Truth." Epistles: "I say the Truth in

Christ;" "As the Truth of Christ is in me." The Gospel Christ is a character of wisdom; "He was made wisdom unto us," declares St. Paul. An unselfish Christ looks out of the Gospel record; "Even Christ pleased not himself," we read (Rom. xv.). The meekness and gentleness of Christ in the Gospel is connoted by St. Paul's: "I beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ." The Gospel feature of Christ's love and charity are matched abundantly by St. Paul's ecstatic exclamations: "The love of Christ constraineth us!" "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?"

The xiiith Chapter of I. Corinthians presents incarnate charity at its best.

The later incidents in the life of the Gospel Christ are all familiarly mentioned, too. His death, burial and resurrection on the third day. That He was seen by Peter, then of the Twelve, then of five hundred, then of James, then of all the Apostles. But this is all so easily and naturally said as to be nothing more than bare allusion. The ascension is treated in like manner, and not as a new fact in His life and history.

If we *then* open the Gospels and compare St. Paul's Christ with the Christ of His immediate followers, will we find the same or a different Christ? If not, as all will be ready to concede, then have we crossed the bridge over the imaginary chasm which Mrs. Besant says yawns between A.D. 1—300.

BRIDGE NO. 2.—EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS. From Clement of Rome to Justin Martyr (A.D. 140); or, better, from Justin Martyr, we walk over a bridge which brings us to the Four Gospels. Such men as Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas, and others existed; as well as Marcion, an early heretic, and Tatian, another heretic. Dr. Westcott writes in this manner concerning this bridge:—"The Gospel which the fathers announce includes all the articles of the ancient creeds. Christ, we read, our God, the Word, the Lord and Creator of the World, who was with the Father before time began, humbled Himself and came down from Heaven and was manifested

in the flesh, and was born of the Virgin Mary, of the race of David according to the flesh, and a star of exceeding brightness appeared at His birth. Afterwards He was baptized of John to fulfill all righteousness, and then, speaking of His Father's message, He invited not the righteous but sinners to come to him. Perfume was poured over His head, an emblem of immortality which He breathed on the Church. At length, under Herod and Pontius Pilate, He was crucified, and vinegar and gall were given Him to drink. But on the first day of the week He rose from the dead, the first fruits of the grave, and many prophets were raised by Him for whom they had waited. After His resurrection He ate with His disciples. He ascended into Heaven, sat at the right hand of the Father, and thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

Reading these authors, who were not mythical characters, and *then* opening our Gospels, the question will suggest itself: May it not, after all, be true that these Four Gospels moulded the second-century traditions of Christendom, and not the traditions the Four Gospels? Thus we learn *the substantial identity* of the original Christ with the Christ of the Catholic Church. In dealing face to face with modern unbelief, we are not so much in quest for evidence of the *genuineness* or *authenticity* of the sacred records, as for an answer to the question: Who and what is the real Christ of history? Let us ourselves try this method, pleads our author; and let us persuade the people to read for themselves these works, as they form a course of very instructive readings, and as they are accessible to the English and German readers. Care should be taken by every faithful pastor that the people should hear the right side first upon this subject, from us, instead of from the secularist lecturers and pamphleteers.

Finally: Mr. Footman called attention to the not unreasonable apprehensions which many thoughtful men cannot but entertain concerning the ultimate influence which popular atheism and materialism exert on the MORALS OF OUR TIMES.

The materialistic philosophy, the predominance of the physico-chemical view of man, the loss of all vital faith in the existence of an eternal person to whom each man is responsible; all this is likely, even against the expressed wish of the most eminent leaders of modern unbelief, to give a terrible stimulus to the darker side of our nature, and to lend aid to its philosophical plausibilities, so as to establish the ethics of self-indulgence and the creed of lust. Says one: "I cannot imagine any style of preaching more attractive to half-educated or to dissolute men and women, than that which you quote (from Mrs. Besant and others), while there are others who have no time to give to the considerations of metaphysics, who are fascinated by the negations, and not sorry to be relieved from the disturbing influences of early teaching, and who do not wish to have any fresh sanctions of morality put in the place of those from which they rejoice to feel themselves freed." From a morsel like this we may learn the gravity of the situation. Plainly stated, under the reign of the new philosophy, the sternest reproof that can be administered to the worst and vilest of men is that their lives will result in a "miscalculation." Pleasure being their only God, and pain the only devil, it is only possible to tell the secularist that he is mistaken, but nothing worse. And in the course of a few generations, the new theology being triumphant, and the old religious and ethical "superstitions" bred out of men, even the feelings of shame, the very initial sense of sin and personal responsibility, will no longer be generated. It is necessary to face the ultimate results of these *tendencies* of the ethics of materialism, surely. And this is the loud challenge for the ministry.

Mr. Footman draws a picture of the *future* state of human society under the rule of materialist or secularist's ethics, by going *back* eighteen hundred years, and putting the language of the epicurean materialist or physico-chemical moralist into the mouths of Paul and Felix.

Felix: "Pleasures and pains are matters of taste. The

synthesis of organs (which the vulgar call Felix) experiences no sensations of pleasure so intense, and so self-regarding, as those which the present line of life procures. These sensations of pleasure may not perhaps last quite so long as those which that synthesis of organs called Paul wishes to habituate the synthesis called Felix. But it prefers, or, to adopt the metaphor of the metaphysician, 'I' prefer intensity to duration. That may be an imprudence, a mistake, from your point of view; but neither from your point of view nor from mine can it be what is vulgarly called a *sin*. The only mistake which I am afraid of, is that of incurring the wrath of Cæsar. But I have a brother at court, a powerful synthesis of organs, upon whose influence I can depend for the favorable adjustment of my relations with the Imperial authority. This Cæsar's wrath is the only judgment to come I have any need to dread, and against this I am insured. Sensation, we are agreed, ceasing with the organs of sense, nay, if there be a soul, I myself ceasing with the scattering of that soul's exceedingly fine particles, there can be no pain which I cannot at once put an end to, when life becomes intolerable, by embracing what even the rigid Stoic calls the *Kalā Exagōgā* of suicide. Responsibility, too, ceasing with my power to answer, and with the dream of a living Judge and Ruler beyond, to whom any answer can be given, what you call my conscience may be reasoned into peace and restrained from paining me now, without any superstitious dread of its reviving, in the future, any of the remembrances or torments of the past."

Thus it becomes vividly plain that we cannot reason with any generation of men upon righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, upon any such *retrograde* and pagan principles as those in which, in the name of, but not with the sanction of, science, we are sometimes invited now to take refuge, and which are offered as *substitutes* for those Divine sanctions here and hereafter which it is proposed to explode. In this picture we may see a warning of what we may come to,

or of what, when all godliness is bred out, or whipped out of our children's children, *they* may come to, if we do not mind what we are about.

Our author wants the ministry to act as good "watch dogs" of Christian civilization and of moral progress, and point out faithfully to men, even at the risk of seeming impertinent alarmists, the retrograde tendency of much of the popular philosophy and of the whole secularist view of life and of society. Even some of the missionaries of secularism will be gotten to see that they are advocating principles which, if universally or generally accepted and acted upon, will put the world backward instead of forward, and evolve us downwards instead of upwards, nearer to the ape and to the dust than to the ideal manhood towards which all pure and ardent souls must ever yearn.

The best recommendation for Mr. Footman's "reasonable apprehensions and reassuring hints" is the fact that you are not done with the work when you have read it through. It is one of those books which are chiefly valuable for what you are enabled to "read between the lines," for the store of rich suggestions which they furnish. The reader is not willing to lay it *away*, though he lays it down. He studies it on and on, both with and without its handling.

His final words are in the nature of an exhortation, so apt for the minister of the Gospel. Dealing as he does with the mass of people, it is just on the *moral* ground that he can gather the most material of hope, where lies also the darkest shadow of apprehension. If the Christian creed be true, in the inner man, in each man's conscience are still the sparks of celestial light which may be kindled into a flame by a wise pastor. It is his business and privilege to deal with the Spirit of God as with a Divine ally. He is not far from any one of us, philosopher or critic, secularist or atheist, priest or prophet, although we may refuse to recognize His presence or to listen to His voice within. Most pathetic is Mr. Footman's note:—

"When I was vicar of Shoreditch, I often took down the baptismal register book, and looked steadily at the name of 'CHARLES BRADLAUGH' there, and prayed and wondered about him. The answer I generally got was this—'The Spirit of God has not done with Charles Bradlaugh yet.'"

We now close our review of the work, from which we have culled so largely, with the hope of inducing the reader to purchase it, in order that he may draw from it the same measure of good it brought to us, if not more.

IV.

THE PRIESTLY RELATION OF CHRISTIANS TO GOD.

(A chapter from : "*Das Geistliche Priestertum des Christen*," by Prof. D. B. Madsen, of Copenhagen, translated from the German edition of Pastor Schumacher, at Hohenstein in Holstein, 1882, by Rev. William Hall, of New York.)

THE immediate relation to God of the priest of the Old Testament, bears wholly the symbolical and external character peculiar to the institutions of the ancient Covenant. Such relation to God, then, could not find place in spirit and in truth ; it was rather prophecy than reality. It is true there is found within the Old Dispensation a series of conspicuous examples of immediate communication on the side of God to men, and, therefore, of an answering, wonderful intercourse between God and men ; we mention such personages as Moses, Samuel, Elias and, in general, the men whom God selected as its bearers in the course of the progressive unfolding of revelation. But these occasional facts, the grandeur of which, in comparison with those of the New Testament, agrees accurately with the differences existing between the two Testaments, lie out above those conditions which, at the institution of the Covenant, were given, once for all, as the normal. It cohered with those conditions, that the whole people, in the literal and spiritual sense, were living far from God, however relatively, compared with heathen nations, they might bear the name of the people standing near to God. Even the Levitical priesthood, with its external access to the dwelling of God, had, in the *spiritual sense*, just as little an immediate access to God as the people excluded from the sanctuary.

The priests were separated by the veil from the most holy place ; and when the high-priest, on the day of atonement,

was to go in to the holiest with the blood of atonement, he must (Levit. 16: 13) have a cloud of incense before him, so that, beholding the mercy-seat where the Lord was present, he might not die. So also the veil, which shut off the sanctuary from the people and the holiest of all from the priests, was in reality also for him, only in another figure. The Old Testament declares therewith, that even the high-point of its privileges was not able to procure for man the true communion, the way to the holiest of all not yet having been made manifest, as is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9: 8). On the contrary, in the New Covenant, the actually immediate relation to God for all those who, in spirit and in truth, have been received among the people of the Covenant, exists daily and forever. By the perfection of the eternally valid atonement of Christ, the veil has been rent in twain (Matt. 27: 51)—the spiritual veil, which bars the sinner's access to that signified by the holiest of all, to the place where God is essentially present—to the full communion with God. By the work of Christ, the fully sufficient propitiatory offering has been made, and therewith, also, the free access to the grace of God opened (Heb. 1: 3; 8: 12; 9: 12, 26, 28; 13: 10). And, by the impartation of the Holy Spirit, men are put into the condition to make use of this open access thereto, so as now actually to enter into the immediate relation to God. For, from the moment when the powers of the finished work of Christ and of His glorified personality are at the command of the Holy Ghost, the work of the Spirit consists not, as in the Old Testament herein, that He operates *upon* men, drawing, converting and sanctifying them, but He indwells and works *in* them, as the regenerating, transforming and new-creating Spirit (John 7: 38-29).^{*} With these new objective pre-suppositions of Christianity the whole relation to God becomes one entirely new. The same subjective spiritual motions, which are always peculiar to the relation to God, can now work under perfectly new conditions, and become thereby themselves of another nature. The persona

^{*} Comp. Oehler Alttestament Theol. 2, 168.

consciousness of sin, which, if it is otherwise in earnest, always feels itself placed immediately before God (Ps. 51 : 6 : Against Thee only have I sinned), was not, in the Old Testament, to succeed in unfolding its full inwardness. For, certainly, through the future's promise there had been brought to view a yet-to-be forgiving and blotting out of all sin ; yet a life with a perfectly developed consciousness of *present* sin, and with it, the outlook upon a merely *future* forgiveness, no man is able to endure. Therefore, however vitally the pious might hold fast to the promise, they must still have something whereon to hold in the present, and, therefore, could not wholly escape being bound to the impersonal grounds of trust which were expressed in the institutions of the people : in the reliance upon the mediatorial, in themselves wholly unsuffering* sacrificial acts, and in the quieting by the good conscience of a likewise imperfect righteousness of right living. But in itself the earnest consciousness of sin carried the impulse of a desire for a comfort of a higher kind : for an answer from God, just as personal and immediately present as was the confession of sin turning itself to God. Doubtless the Old Testament saints, in the highest and richest moments of their life, also had such experiences of God's forgiving grace (Ps. 32 : 5 ; 34 : 19 ; 103 ; Prov. 28 : 13). Nevertheless these experiences were wanting in the degree of an objective foundation within the revealed order of salvation, were so exclusively only subjective that they could not get beyond the transient and sporadic, and could not establish a durable inner peace, a certainty, valid for the whole life of the experienced justification.† In the new Covenant, on the contrary, where the postulates for the fully-pacifying answer of the present grace of God have arisen, the Spirit drives the consciousness of sin up to the full, in order to lead the soul to the life fully set free from all impersonal grounds of comfort, in the experience of sin's forgiveness.

* Heb. 9 : 9. *Θυσίαι μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι λατρεύοντα* ; 10 : 1-4.

† Comp. Oehler *Alttestament Theol.* 2, 166-169.

Upon this way of experience it was that the relation of the spiritual priesthood to God, opened to the Reformer of our Church in such a manner that, for all time, what he livingly experienced, will be and remain a type for the introduction of a man into the depths of this priestly relation. His development in this regard coincides with his development as the Reformer; for the spiritual priesthood became, and necessarily became, his point of support in the great reformatory struggle. The inner history of the rise of the Reformation begins in Luther's soul, with the stirring inward sin-consciousness before God, with the experience that the question: saved or lost? is a matter in which every one *has immediately to do with God*. He felt the anguish before God's holy wrath, and experienced the human impotence to perform anything that could stand before this tribunal. Therefore he felt the emptiness, the entire vanity and uselessness, in all supplementary means for the actual divine forgiveness to which the Church pointed him: in the trust-grounds of the hierarchy and of works.

The anguished conscience found, in all this, only partition-walls, by which access to God Himself was barred; and it was precisely the access to God for which he longed: he needed God's own assurance of grace and forgiveness—such an assurance as is attended with the inner, personal, undeceptive certainty that it comes from God. In this desire and longing of his the principle of spiritual priesthood is really, preparatively, in motion, although only in its negative expression. For the spiritual priesthood is first *born* when man no more stands far from God, after whom he longs, separated by a wide interval, but with open face (2 Cor. iii.), has looked into God's fatherly eye. This Luther experienced when the Spirit made the word of sin's forgiveness alive in his heart, so that he heard the voice of God personally to him. He perceived in the Gospel word the heart-beat of God's love; the Spirit made this clear to him as a word from that God with whom *his* salvation lay near to heart. Then he realized sin's forgiveness as a gift reached forth to him by God's father-hand for Christ's

sake without a Mediator's intervention. Now he knew by the experience of faith that he possessed God's grace, and that his conscience could dare to rest in the peace of the reconciliation (τελευθεῖς κατὰ συνείδησιν, Heb. 9: 9 *). "The Spirit himself witnesses with our spirit that we are God's children" (Rom. 8: 16). Also Gal. 4: 6 and 2 Cor. 1: 22. Through this inly entering into communion with God's fatherly love, where faith is found to be the way of the children to the Father, the relation of men to God wins the *priestly* character as its central point; for faith is now no more an historical, impersonal thing, but a faith, which, without limits or partition walls, stands in an *immediate relation of experience* with the Triune God Himself. The spiritual priestly relation is not without farther identification with faith in its entire universality; but it is the immediate relation in which the faith of experience becomes certain of its justification, stands to its God. A relation is *immediate* when its existence is proved by a reciprocity between the factors of the relation themselves without room being left for intermediates and guaranters. But this is precisely the nature of the relation to God, into which faith, thus made alive, has entered.

This immediate relation to God's *grace*, is the first, as well as the final and middle point in the idea of the spiritual priesthood. Of this relation the Epistle to the Hebrews when, in the assurance that its readers, once for all, have "come nigh to God" (12: 22-23), exhorts them, μετὰ παρόρρησιος προσέρχεσθαι τῷ θεῷ τῆς χάριτος (4: 16; comp. 7: 25, προσέρχεσθαι τῷ θεῷ; 7: 19, ἐγγίξεν τῷ θεῷ): παρρησία designates the confidence, which is without fear and doubt, the child-like, free spirit, which then knows that justification has been given to it, and which, therefore, approaches joyfully, sure of the hearing (comp. Rhiehm, Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefts, p. 739). With this joyful certainty that we stand in the relation of grace to God, is our constant approach to be. Still more comprehensively the same Epistle names the ob-

* Walch, 12, 323. Comp. Luther, Walch 2, 1985 et seq.

jective conditions of this approach (10: 19, seq.): it is the entrance to the heavenly Holy of Holies to which this joy is given; also the entering into the place where God is essentially present, where we have converse with Him and stand in full communion with Him. And the two objective conditions on which our drawing-nigh rests are, first, the blood of Jesus, with which He has entered in for us, consecrating the way for us, which leads through His flesh as through the veil, that has been opened only for those who enter by the appropriation of His sacrificial death; and the second pre-supposition is this, that He is interceding and active for us in heaven (v. 21. The same thought Peter (i. 3: 18) and Paul (Eph. 2: 18; 3: 12, *παρόρησιν καὶ προσαγγωγὴν*; comp. Rom. 5: 2) express in simplest form that we are brought nigh to God, *i. e.*, placed in near communion with Him.* The passage (Eph. 2: 18) expresses the thought in special fullness, since it gathers the activity of the Trinity around it: Christ is the door through which we have access to the Father, and the Spirit is He by whose communication this drawing-nigh has been given, and through whom the access is sure to be found.

The mutual, immediate, personal relation between God as the gracious Father and man as God's child, is the central expression for the conditions of life given in their entire fullness through the *absolute religion*; for therein it is declared that man, though living in time, may still have the riches of the heavenly world as a present actuality. But, however exalted this immediate relation to God, it is not to be sought through the medium of a special spiritual energy, through raptures, or by other mystical ways as enthusiasts imagine. For, although the most Holy place, in which we are to meet God, is, to be sure, on the one hand, as the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it, "above all heavens," in a transcendence which is inaccessible to us under earthly conditions (Heb. 6: 19); on the other hand, God has condescended thereto by making a dwelling for Himself on this side of the world—has made the Church "His

* Weiss, *Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, p. 259, seq.

house," and wills to build for Himself in every man a temple (1 Cor. 3: 16; 6: 19), into which He solemnly enters with the riches of His love, to dwell therein (John 14: 17-18, 23; Eph. 3: 17), and to be in communion with the man. Even to restore the immediate relation to God, there is no other way than this all-sufficing one, the universally valid means of grace. In them the Spirit makes the Lord in the Church present to every man. An immediate divine communication, with evasion of these means, the Church knows not of; but these means are not limits also to the immediateness of God's presence; they do not render His self-communications less immediate; for in these means He doth not place a shadow of Himself, but even His very being. The immediate relation excludes not means, but *intermediates*.

In baptism, inclosed by the word of annunciation, the priestly consecration goes before. Baptism is the sacrament of the election. Here God executes in every one His sanctifying consecration,—a consecration in which the symbolical parts of the Old Testament priestly consecration attain their fulfillment. In this significant relation to baptism the Epistle to the Hebrews (10: 22) shows us the direct way; there can be no doubt that that one of the objective pre-suppositions of our *προσέρχασθαι*, which is designated by *λελουμέναι τὸ σῶμα ὑδασι καθαροῦ*, refers to water-baptism, which is thus set over against the Old Testament priestly washing as antitype; and it may be added, if we would carry the significance farther, that baptism lays the priestly garments upon us (the investiture, *i. e.*, the putting on the holiness and righteousness of Christ), and is the anointing oil by which the Spirit's communication is not merely symbolized, but really takes place. This communication of the Holy Ghost bestows upon the predicated sanctity of the priesthood assumed from the Old Testament (1 Peter 2: 5) its peculiar New Testament fullness. According to its universal Biblical idea, sanctification is setting apart from the world and dedication to God and to His holy service. Holiness is consequently a constant predicate of *every* priesthood;

but it is peculiar to the New Testament priesthood that it is in possession of the Holy Spirit, in possession of the divine principle of holiness itself, which in its priests has become an inner impulse of power. By this consecration, God has given *Himself* to be to us in immediate relation, has taken us up into His sphere of life and operation, and made Himself present by the implantation of His Spirit in our hearts. And it is now thus that the Spirit's indwelling attains to such overflow that *we*, too, on our side, draw nigh to God (*προσερχόμεναι*, 1 Peter 2: 4), that we respond to His presence with the appropriation, which gives itself up to Him just as immediately as He hath given Himself unto us—accepts and lives with Him. Then first comes into being the reciprocal activity (*Wechselwirkung*) and the community of life wherein the immediate relation to God consists. The priestly relation, moreover, arises as the objective word in which God communicates Himself, concurs with the subjectivity in its spiritual apprehension of the same. The priestly relation arises when faith is no more that faith of authority which yields itself up to the words of others, but is that become free through experience, in which we can say: "We believe no more on account of what others report, for we have ourselves heard and come to know that this is truly the Saviour of the world."

In this immediate relation to *grace*, in this living, personal certainty of justification, is also given the immediate relation to Christian *truth*. The same man to whom thus grace has demonstrated its real presence, has also essentially entered into the experience of the self-proving power of Christian *truth*. For grace and the forgiveness of sin, is the all-ruling middle-point in the saving truth which is preached; and has this Gospel in its *centre*, shown to the firmer experience its immediately convincing power, then is, therewith, the whole truth fundamentally laid open to the priestly, the immediate appropriation. The Christian truth is, on *its* side, *one* connected organism, and the interior nature of man is also, on *its* side, a connected organism; is the understanding reached at its centre, then, if

opportunity and demand are found for its unfolding, truth must go through in its totality. By that decisive inner contact with truth at its centre, have the thoughts of the kingdom of God, according to their nature and in their own manner, been revealed to man. He in whose soul the light of revealed truth has been kindled, must be called the consecrated one, though in other respects he may stand only on the threshold of Christian knowledge; for he has come out over the life-stadium where God's revelation was a strange sphere to him, and in its stead the principle of a living, divine knowledge has been implanted in him (1 Cor. 2: 10, 12, 14). But the knowledge into which he has entered, is that which is described by Paul as *ἐμπύκνωσις*, i. e., the experimental consent, the concordance which rests on a personal holding to the truth and goes forth from it ("I understand thee, because I believe"). It is not the theological, the theoretical cognition of Christianity that here meets us; even of this it is certain, though otherwise true and genuine, it must act upon such a personal action; but the converse is not that the same cognition with this assent, but without something more, can have being. On the contrary, the knowledge which is given to every one who has entered the sphere of spiritual priesthood, is the acceptance of the *spirit* and *essence* of Christianity as *practical life-truth*: as that practical life-truth which satisfies the conscience with the peace of reconciliation, makes his destiny clear to man and shows him his way. Entrance into the priestly relation pre-supposes that the man has understood and accepted the will of God as that which answers to his own being; *rest* and feel at home we cannot in that which is strange to our nature, but only in what satisfies and pacifies our longing and deepest desires. Therefore is the law of *development* this: that the knowledge of truth and self-knowledge advanced in reciprocal co-action. Revelation helps me to understand myself, my own spiritual life-needs; and, conversely, by thus understanding of myself, I attain to a penetrating understanding of Revelation in its fulness. While revealed truth thus, in this course of develop-

ment, demonstrates itself as the answer to my deepest inquiries, it is confirmed with the same certainty with which I must assume the realities of my own nature. Hence the appropriation of Christianity becomes a life of the profoundest freedom.

Christian truth treats man as a being born for freedom; it bids him, it is true, follow its guidance, but, at the same time, to exercise his spiritual sense in distinguishing the true and the false, and offers itself to him for his *conviction* (John 16 : 8). Thus Christianity proposes the same conditions as every truth which would enter into relation with the personal life of man. But this in regard to Christianity, is of so much greater significance as, on the one hand, the contents of Revelation (in distinction from all human truth), are inaccessible to the natural man, so that Christianity must be certain of possessing means of conviction of incomparable power; and as, on the other hand, Revelation offers to satisfy man's inmost and deepest nature; therefore, also, in the way of the profoundest and most deeply seizing conviction, must be able to prove itself to be his own fundamental destination—as that which man must embrace (wollen), if he will be himself.

Christian truth annexes itself to the conscience of every man earnestly appropriating it to himself, as the most certain and undeniable reality of his spiritual life,—as that which he cannot give up without transgressing against the holiest and most unassailable promises of his own nature (Hebrews 6 : 4-6). However many human teachers and guides may have been active in promoting truth's victory over us, in whole or in part, so far as this personal appropriation goes forward, it is of moment to call no man Rabbi; for One is our Master (Matt. 23 : 8). Our relation to truth is a relation at first hand, and such that we know ourselves therein to be in an inner independence of all human authorities. Compare Luther: *Operæ latina varii argumenti*, V. 102 (*Sicut dicit Augustinus*); *Veritate ipsa sic capitis animæ, ut per eam de omnibus certissime judicare possit, sed veritatem judicare non possit, dicere autem*

cogatur infallibile certitudine, hanc esse veritatem. Walch 19: 736, "Every one must alone, therefore, believe that it is God's Word, and that he may inwardly experience that it is truth, although an angel from heaven and all the world should preach against it." *Opera Lat.*, V. a. VI.: 523, "*Christianus ita certus est, quid credere et non credere debeat, ut etiam pro eo ipsa moriatur aut saltem mori paratus sit*, etc. Again, Walch 11: 1887-90, "Thou must be so certain of the matter that it is the Word of God as certain as thou livest, and still more certain; for upon this only must thou take thy stand; for thou must not rest thy judgment upon the Pope or on any other man; thou must thyself be competent to say: this saith God, not that; this is right, that is wrong; else it is not possible to stand."

My soul is "captured" by the reasons of Revelation; will any one work changes in my Christian knowledge? that can be done only so far as he knows how to use these reasons as his weapons. For he who has been convinced by truth itself is therewith also deaf to all external claims of authority; for him there is no other proper spiritual authority than that which comes up with this truth's own arguments. This unity of life with Christian truth will demand not only, according to its nature, long development, but also bring with it many a struggle; for man's interior is unclear and groping in the understanding of itself, and unfolds in sound tendencies only slowly and with difficulty, contending with ever new disturbances. Yea, we must certainly say that no individual man, under temporal life-conditions, succeeds in leading a life of appropriation so healthful and comprehensive that this living unity with truth can attain its end in any perfect degree. For there will always be something over against which we have to observe a merely obedient relation, without having assimilated it to ourselves, as something freely our own (Scripture and Church); nevertheless this obedience will be, in spite of that, wholly different from a slavish, *blind* obedience, because we once for all time and immutably have made the experience

that where appropriation offers difficulties to us we are to regard Revelation right and ourselves wrong. This experience establishes on *one side* the *free* positive trust in the infinite spiritual superiority of Revelation, and *ex adverso*, our confidence that its contents will, in due time, be shown to us, even in these points, as the true freedom. And thus is also here the free relation of the spiritual priesthood to its object as respects principle and quality, even if not yet an accomplished reality. Thus, in such wise, developed, *spiritual*, priestly relation to God, is wont to be designated as the "universal" priesthood and as that which is common to all Christians. This expression, it is true, does not directly appear in the Scriptures; nevertheless, it were unjust to regard this as evidence that the New Testament does not recognize such a designation. (*Contra* Bähr in *Stud. and Krit.*, 1862, 14, 17.) Yea, it is certainly true that the object of the Petrine position lies literally in this: to make prominent that the Christian Church, as a *Community*, is the realization of that to which the people of God are destined. It is likewise true: where here the discourse pertains to the priestly idea, this is the chief point, viz.: that while in the Old Covenant the offerings could be only of an external nature, the new people of God can now bring offerings in spirit and in truth. But, on the other hand, obviously nothing is here said to the effect that, while under the Old Testament the priesthood was confined to a special tribe, in the New, all Christians, without distinction, are priests. What is made prominent, is the nature of the sacrifices, and not the number of the offerers. It is, however, clear that these two things cannot be distinguished as two things which do not agree, as they are really only two sides of one and the same thing. Are the offerings spiritual in their nature, then must every co-member of the community owe his special offering, for spiritual sacrifices are of a personal nature. Here the discourse cannot be of an activity of the Community as of an aggregate person in opposition to the individual, but the activity of the whole must be of such a kind that every one, in

his manner, is participant therein; so many of them as bring no offerings, they are not in truth co-members of the offering Whole. The qualitative perfection of the sacrificial gift has necessarily, as a consequence, the quantitative extension to the collective citizens of the Kingdom of God.

It is certainly also obvious that the Apostle with his exhortation addresses himself to *all* Christians, even as many of them as have been regenerated through God's Word. It is, of course, not his meaning that, in every Church communion whatever, *all* the co-members have thus far attained; it is, indeed, self-evidently true of spiritual priesthood, as of faith, that not every man has it;" yea, that it is not even the property of all commonly called believers, certain as it is that this demands a living faith, conscious of itself and become free by a personal appropriation.

"But spiritual priesthood expresses the *idea* of every Christian,—the idea, without the realization of which, that upon which he *has* been established, does not attain a right development. Thus understood, the phrase "universal priesthood" expresses fundamental principles of a decisive and inamissible far-reaching import. By this language it is, for example, implied that the spiritual priesthood is attainable by all in an equal degree,—that it does not rest on any one thing, by which, in the order of nature, differences can be conditioned among men. Every one has been fitted to attain to this relation, so certainly as the relation to God and the experiences of this relation are *that* for which every man in the depths of his being, is fitted and equipped; only in the same degree as men have disturbed or promoted the development of this equipment, a difference arises in the conditions which they bring in respectively. The adaptability thereto rests upon something far more central in the man than the sphere of his endowments, culture, knowledge and intellectual outfit. These things can as well hinder as further: for the pre-condition, to be brought into the account, is the soundness of the organ for God (Gottesorgan), and the humble willingness and receptivity which

will let itself be guided upon the way to a personal self knowledge. It is a word of warning to the wise and spiritually cultured of all times which Christ addressed to the chief priests and elders: "The publicans and harlots enter into the kingdom of God before you." There will always be those who, in spite of all radical errors of their being, have preserved their receptivity and sense for truth, while others, on the contrary, have gone so far in the one or other direction, through their human over-culture, that they have lost thereby the organs of truth which are hidden in the deepest depths of primitive human nature (Eccl. 7: 29). In the designation, the "universal priesthood," lies further: that they who have entered the priestly relation stand on an equality with regard to the priestly life-conditions,—that, to them all, stand at command the equal sources and means of a living progress. There worketh in them the one and same Spirit; the same way of prayer stands open to them all, that thereby they may enter livingly into communion with God, and there are presented to them the same means of grace. This equal position of Christians which, in these points, is an obvious one, is also true of the Holy Scriptures. It is common to all Christians, that the fruit of Bible-reading rests upon this, that they bring with them to it a sense of the vital worth of the Scripture,—a sense with which the Church equally equips all her children. Is this sense wanting, then is the use of Scripture, even for the theologian, with all the helps standing at his command, essentially unfruitful. When, on the contrary, this sense exists, there is at hand all that is essential for the appropriation, even to the unlearned Bible-reader; for what is decisive and chief in its contents the Scripture expresses so clearly, that for winning a clear and sure insight therein, no other means are requisite than those which every Christian possesses. It is something otherwise if we address ourselves to the special and more difficult questions of knowledge. Upon these, however, the furtherance of life does not rest; yea, it happens only exceptionally that these, for the practical business with Scripture, obtain any significance whatever. Therefore is the insight into these,

essentially a need merely for the *Community*, which ought to be able to meet helpfully even a special, only exceptionally arisen desire; and the furthering of such insight is to be wholly assigned to the servants of the Church, who, as organs of the community, are obliged to be in possession of a wider view.

But, in the practical use of Scripture, where the Christian seeks the norms for the sound furthering of his own life, for the growth of the inward man, between the theologian and the layman, there exists no distinction. Yea, history even attests that, at such times and in such communities where another entire view than that of the Scripture ruled in the Church (as in Rationalism and Catholicism), the Bible in the hands of laymen has always been a reforming and reactive might. The well-founded fear by Catholicism of the universal spread of the Bible is a speaking, practical evidence for the correctness of our assertion. Thus there is in the Church neither a secret source of life nor a secret light reserved for the specially privileged.

Laymen proper (*i. e.* eigentliche laien), such as are obliged to let others tell them what wisdom is, and are not able to judge for themselves thereon, do not exist among real and veritable Christians.* In this relation Christianity solves the problem which none of the high human ideas is able to solve, viz.: to initiate all who would be initiated into its sphere of truth, and thus to take away all gnostic spiritual aristocracy. All these ideas must draw an impassable barrier between initiated and uninitiated persons, a barrier that cannot be removed, because these ideas can be revealed only to such among whom a special sense answering to them is existent. Christianity, *per contra*, is the concern of all men; "to the poor the Gospel is preached;" and still the Christian ideal does not accommodate itself for winning popularity; it has rather forces in itself, by which it is able to raise even the consciousness of laymen to a

*Ἰδιώτης, 1 Cor. 14: 16 stands in special opposition to the grace-endowed, and has no relation to the nearness to God and ripe in-living in this relation. Comp. Luther on John 10: 3.

full and ripe understanding. Christianity places all alike, in so far as the singly deciding thing for the growth of the inward man is the truth and heartiness with which the Christian lives day by day in that which is common to all. In the universal priesthood, finally, is expressed, that the inner independence of human authorities which lies in the priestly relation to God, must be for the benefit of all Christians. Every one who, in truth, stands in this relation to God has an equal claim that this his relation to God should be regarded as inviolable, and should be honored.

No one may with force or command interfere with that which, in a peculiar sense, respects my place before God: there I must as well bear the responsibility as also, at the same time, have the liberty to live my own life. To this Christian right Luther is ever returning. No man, says he, has power to make laws over Christians, *i. e.*, to bind consciences (Walch 21: 842). This doctrine of the priesthood of Christians is one of the high, insurmountable points where the whole spiritual difference between Catholicism and Protestantism comes forth most strongly and visibly. Whether we regard the spiritual element or the universality of the priestly relation,—the peculiar spiritual character of the same, or the equal birth-right of all Christians therein,—the antagonism is, in like manner, decisive, since it ever arises from the indissoluble connection between these two sides of the priestly idea. Catholicism knows no equal position of all Christians in their relation to God. It sets up a mediatory office, the function of which from the Lord has become that of setting forward His work, viz.: a capacity to present the expiatory offering as the continuance of his high priestly office, and the infallible didactic authority as the continuance of his prophetic. Grace and truth are thus placed in the hands of the clergy, and only through communication from them can the laity share in these treasures. The sacrificial service and the absolution of the priesthood are conditions of grace,—their infallible knowledge of truth, the condition of the layman's not losing himself in

the darkness of error. In both regards it is the Old Testament feature which is here erected in the Christian Church. Yea, the mediatorial position is here attributed to their priesthood even in a stronger sense than in the Old Testament; for *there* the priesthood was first bound unconditionally to the contents of the existent Revelation, so that it dared add nothing thereto; so there it stood under its control and, if necessary, disciplinably, in contradistinction from the free working of the Divine Spirit in the prophets, before whose divine mission even the priests had to bow. In both respects has the position of the priesthood first become, in Catholicism, that of a formal hierarchy: the priests are the only appointed bearers of the Spirit of God, and are called thereto in order to carry forward the knowledge given by Revelation, according to the necessity of the times. More strongly the mediatorial position, in its exclusive right, cannot be asserted, being lifted above the criticism of others, so indispensable for every one. Catholicism dares not deny the Old Testament character of this mediatorialship; on the contrary, it even sees in it a proof for the truth of the same. "As the Church has received the charge to set forth a visible offering which answers to the Levitical of the old dispensation, so must there be likewise a visible and external priesthood, to which that of the Old Testament has been transferred (Conc. Trid. Sessio XXIII., cap. I). Therefore is the priest *interpres ac mediator Dei et hominum, quæ præcipua sacerdotis functio existinianda est* (Cat. Rom., Part II., cap. II., qu. 23). To this his position in the oblation-activity it corresponds, that he is in absolution *vicarius Christi*; and as respects the communication of truth, the Council and the Pope are in the infallible possession of guidance by the Holy Ghost.

Ancient Protestant polemics have fully performed the task pointing out the inadmissibility in this application of the Old Testament conditions and relations. The Apologetic has already referred the whole assertion that in the new covenant we have an offering to present, standing on a level with the Levitical, back to the showing of the Epistle to the Hebrews:

that such a doctrine denies the full sufficiency of the sacrifice once offered by Christ (*Vide* Apol. Cov. 201: "*Nos docemus sacrificium Christi, morientis in cruce, satisfusus totius pro peccatis mundi, nec indigere aliis sacrificiis, quasi illud non satis fuerist pro peccatis nostris*, etc. Comp. Chemnitz *examen decretorum* Conc. Tridentini 2d, part, p. 1574, 172 b.) It has likewise been proven that absolution is not an act of a judicial nature in any sense which is performed by set intermediates, in the name of God, but a special form of divine declaration of grace to every believer (*Vide* Chemnitz, *Examen 2da pars*, p. 234, 238 b). And the pretensions of the hierarchy to infallibility have been refuted by referring to the fact that it has been enjoined on all Christians to "try the spirits, whether they were of God,"—from which we reason that the Decretals of Councils are to be tried according to the norm of the Scripture (Chemnitz, *Examen 1ma pars*, p. 3). Comp. Luther: "The Holy Ghost has not promised that He would be in councils, but in the hearts of Christians which He knows" (Walch 8, 1033-4).

It is clear that in the Romish Church, as regards laymen, there can be no discourse of an immediate relation to God: the Christian laity have, in this respect, the same position as the people in Judaism; the offering and the absolution of the hierarchy is to make them certain of the divine forgiveness and the infallibility of the hierarchy assures them that they possess the genuine truth as the contents of their faith. This faith is thus not referred immediately to God, but consists in confidence in the Church and obedience to the Church. The assertion that we should believe, not because the Church teaches so to believe, but because we have ourselves experienced the truth of the subject-matter of faith with an inner certainty, would be condemned by Romanists as a dangerous and fanatical principle.

But precisely as strange, according to the Catholic system, is the immediate relation to God, in reality, to the mediatory class in the Church as to the laity. The proposition which forms the sharpest antithesis against the principle of the spiritual priesthood, that "no one can be certain of his gracious

condition," (*Conc. Trid. Sessio VI., cap. 9*), applies not less to the clergy than to the laity. Even he who, according to his office, forms the apex of the hierarchy, is quite as dependent upon the absolution of the father confessor as the lowest layman. And the immediate relation to God in which his inspired knowledge of truth seems to place him does not really deserve this name; for it is an immediate relation to truth in a form not congruous to man and of a purely impersonal nature, a magical inspiration, whereby man is related to truth, not, as elsewhere, resulting from the psychological laws of his being. He is only the impersonal instrument by which the truth is communicated; personally, has he, as to his inner spiritual *habitus*, not come nearer to the truth. The impersonal character of this inspiration is clearly expressed in that it is knit solely to the *office*, to the institution, and is in nowise conditioned through the relation and posture of the personality to the truth through its piety or godliness. The spiritual distance between him and truth becomes thereby not less, that he is incidentally the instrument of its communication; as this instrument he stands properly outside of himself.

The Catholic system has, therefore, at no point room for the divine relation of the spiritual priesthood. We would not, however, on this account, deny that this relation to God has existed among many of the noblest Catholic Christians. The *system* requires, undeniably, only the faith of authority, which, to be sure, can call forth great external deeds, but does not seek transactions with God in the inner world of the soul. But the religious relation, according to its nature, does not consciously enter into the system; but when earnest, deeply and spiritually moved men come into accord with Christianity, then this is a might which makes its claims on the inwardness of the relation contracted Godward valid, even when the surroundings do not invite thereto. The Spirit of God is then able to break through all intermediate walls which are erected between God and men, and to press into receptive hearts with its experiences. But it is the system, as such, of which we say: if

this had room for the relation of the spiritual priesthood to God, then would it of itself vanish away. Because for Catholicism the characteristic point is precisely this: that we have faith in an impersonal faith in the—as we have just shown—equally impersonal faith of the Church; so that (according to this) we have lost the consciousness that Christianity demands of man an immediate personal relation to the personal God, the resignation of the innermost essence of the personality,—and that, answerably thereto, grace and truth reveal themselves inwardly to man. On the contrary, in Catholicism, they are looking after external, tangible guarantees for the truth,—after authorities which are able to assume the responsibility for the correctness of our relation to God,—and thus man's relation becomes really a mere relation at second hand. The high freedom-consciousness that by being only bound to the truth, it feels itself in opposition to all bondage to man (1 Cor. 7: 23),—this consciousness, in which the Apostolic time lived, and which was brought to light again by the Reformation, has been lost by Catholicism.

Hence it is evident that, in this point, a mutual concordance between the two Church-communions is impossible. To *Protestantism*, the inwardness of the relation to God, is the indispensable thing not to be made good by any advantages *aliunde*. It dreads, before all things, a making this relation anything external, and faith a *holding for true*, in which man does not stand in his own personality. In spite of all the waverings and contests which its history presents, and which, in consequence of the sinful quality of human nature, must everywhere be found, it beholds behind the manifold dissent, a great and comforting unity, precisely in what makes out the centre of the truth of salvation and binds hearts to Christ. *Catholicism*, on the contrary, hears only mistrustfully of the power of truth to create a firmly-grounded, immediately personal conviction (*Catholic Scepticism*, vide Martensen *Catholicismus und Protestantismus*); do we discourse of the conscience that feels itself bound to truth by the way of a self-realized assurance, then it discovers

therein only an expression of enthusiastic subjectivity which has cheaply sold itself to the erring lights of individual incidental inspiration, and thus permits itself to be captured as well by lies as by truth. From this mistrust of the inwardly binding might of truth, it of necessity follows that impersonal objective authorities offer the only protection against arbitrariness and error,—and that they are able only through outward commands and prescribed laws to regulate the Christian life, otherwise destitute of chart and compass.

From this gross point of view of objective institutions, Catholics must, of necessity, look down upon Protestantism as upon a chaos of confusions. And it cannot surprise us if they, specially against the principle of spiritual and universal priesthood, raise the complaint that it is the principle of self-will and atomism, and carries in itself the dissolution of authority and communion. (Comp. Möhler's *Symbolik*, 6, Edit. pp. 404, Seq.) In the meanwhile we cannot feel ourselves hit by these accusations, for whether this charge applies to a willing or an unwilling hostility to authority, it arises from a process of thought, for which this spiritual dilemma alone exists, either enslaving authority, which demands nothing but obedience, or an unbridled individualism, which inquires not after objective truth, but only after an inner witness of the Spirit. It, by no means, belongs to the principle of spiritual priesthood, that we should appeal exclusively to the witness of the Spirit, to the setting aside and passing over of authority, for, in the first place, Protestantism bows still more unconditionally than Catholicism before the acknowledged authorities of revelation, and stands, by no means, in covenant with the humanistic autonomy which goes forth to seek truth in its own way. It inquires, first of all, and with entire earnestness, what says the word of God? and primarily, on the ground of obedience, does it desire freedom. Protestantism is not authorityless, has not merely an inner authority over the spirit, but is, in its universal essence, bound to the history of Revelation, and is the appropriation of the contents of the same. Protestantism fears

nothing so much as, under the name of appropriation, to disfigure the contents of Revelation. Nevertheless it expects, according to the word of the Lord (John 7: 17; 8: 32), that man should find his own true nature in this authority; that he can feel himself made free and transferred into a really personal life and a really spiritual domiciliation in the new life-sphere. For such a life is, under all relations, the idea and posture of man, and Christianity will not attain to victory by stifling in man anything that is human. Protestantism knows also how to value *derived* authority—Church, human teachers. It permits us, however, to try them all according to the true and real high authority of Revelation, and it will not allow to them a *vicarious* position, will not regard them as set up as barriers between itself and the peculiar original authority; because a relation to religion, at first hand, is man's noblest and most indestructible right.

No complaint against Protestantism can be more groundless than that the right recognition of the community is wanting to it, and that it leads away therefrom. On the contrary, Protestantism knows very well that we can come into relation with Christ only through the means of grace, which can be given to us only in and by the community (Society, Church), and that our education to be Christians, proceeds only through guidance on the side of the community, going before. It knows not less that the community has not a mere educating significance, much more that no one of the community *outgrows* it, that perfection does not consist in this, that one should grow over and beyond the common life; but in this, that we should grow into it more and more deeply, and that each shall participate more and more fully in the associative and reciprocally sustaining activity in which Christians live. Protestantism declares prominently and with a clear consciousness, that the individual grows in health only as a member in the body of the community. And all this our Protestant Church does not contradict in its foundation principle of the universal priesthood. No one has spoken richer words respecting the union of the

Christian with the community, and with the other members of the Body of Christ, than the same Luther, who so strongly insists upon the universal priesthood, and that even in the same writings. (*Von der Freiheit eines Christian-Man*, Walch 19, 1234-5). If, in spite of this, Catholicism is not pacified, it comes again from this, that it dares not venture to make man free, in the expectation that he will, upon the way of freedom, be most profoundly joined with all who share the like faith. It doubts the power of truth to *gather together* on the way of freedom, and opposing its mistrust to this guarantee of unity, he slides into an outward political notion of unity, where there is a necessary impulse to stretch the demand for external uniformity still higher. Protestantism wishes not this fixed unity, which is won at the cost of the inmost essence of faith, and, therefore, really does not deserve the name of unity. For, in the world of faith, unity exists in harmony with that of hearts and consciences; but should these factors come earnestly into motion, even then differences must be found among us.

"Out of all, follows now the conclusion, that a Christian man lives not in himself but in Christ and his neighbor; in Christ through faith, in the neighbor through love. This is the right spiritual, Christian freedom, which makes the heart free from all sins, laws and prescriptions, and which excels all other freedom, as heaven doth the earth."—*Luther*.

V.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE BIBLE FOUNDED ON THE FRUITS OF CHRISTIANITY CONTRASTED WITH THOSE OF INFIDELITY.

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM.

IN attempting to exhibit reasons for believing the Bible to be true one might note the striking fact of its *popularity*. But this fact cannot be relied on exclusively or confidently as an evidence of its divine origin, of its credibility, or of its excellence. Sin is more popular than the Bible. And many books are popular that are neither divine, nor true, nor excellent. It is in favor of the popularity of the Bible, however, that it exists—1. Among the *better classes* of the people. 2. *It is permanent*. 3. *It is constantly growing*.

Another striking fact is in favor of the Bible, viz.: that it meets its most bitter enemies among bad people. It cannot be denied, indeed, that many cultivated minds oppose it, and that people, who in some respects appear morally correct in their lives, lend their influence toward breaking it down, which, however, only shows that a cultivated mind is not necessarily religious, and that outward moral character is not always an evidence of good judgment or of sound religious views. And besides this, it is true, that the degraded, the vile, the ungodly, and every class of people who are inimical to the welfare of mankind, all agree in their hatred and opposition to the Bible. All who are at this day enemies to governments and to the peace of society, who delight in incendiarism, in cruelty and blood, and would turn the world into a pandemonium in order to gratify their lusts, and to abolish law and order that they may be untrammelled in their wickedness, are antagonists of

the Bible. They are well aware that where its influence prevails their diabolical purposes are frustrated. The learned who write against the Bible and lecture against it are only aiding and abetting these bad men and giving them comfort and encouragement in their work of destruction. But it is to the credit and in favor of the Bible and its religion that such classes of people are its enemies.

Another significant fact in its favor appears in this, that the majority of its adherents, both at home and in heathen lands, have been won from the ranks of the enemy. We say *the majority* of its friends, because a good many of them, having been nurtured and grown up under its benign influence, were never identified with its enemies. Many of the children of believing parents, baptized in their infancy and rightly instructed in its precepts, have always been friends of the Bible.

In connection with its conquests from the ranks of the enemy, there is the still more significant truth that the moral superiority and the spiritual elevation of the friends of the Bible owe their existence to its influence on their minds and hearts; while the hatred of the enemy arises chiefly from this, that the Bible condemns and rebukes, in unmeasured terms, every sin of which they are guilty, and sets before them the example of a perfect Life whose very existence puts their wickedness to shame.

Again, the lives and sayings of good men, from the earliest ages to the present time, show that they believed the Bible and regulated their conduct by its directions. Even those who lived before any part of it was reduced to writing, but whose history it records, were governed by the unwritten yet revealed precepts of this sacred book. To this number may be added the majority of the eminent scientists of our own day, in this and in other lands. This assertion is made in full view and appreciation of the fact, that here and there an eminent scholar has fallen to the side of the enemy and dragged with him a number of lesser lights in philosophy and science.

The divine origin of the Bible and of the religion it inculcates is very strongly declared, by the renewing and transforming power which it exhibits in the conversion of notorious sinners. Such examples have been witnessed in innumerable instances wherever the gospel has been preached; to which, also, may be properly added, the leavening and sanctifying power of its doctrines on all who conscientiously endeavor to put them into practice.

As a reason for this unique power, it is in place to state that the living inspiration and source of Bible doctrine is Christ, whose person and testimony constitute the substance of its contents, and a study of whose character and testimony, together with the above stated facts, is sufficient to convince any reasoning mind of the credibility of the Bible and of the divinity of its origin.

Such arguments, however, do not exhaust the theme. They serve rather to suggest others equally as strong, and it may be, to some minds, more conclusive.

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments for the divinity and credibility of the Bible, aside from its own testimony, is the existence of Christianity and the church, considered in connection with the great and good things accomplished in the world by their presence and influence. There is the existence of Christianity, the miracle of history, a living, concrete, historical fact, which cannot be set aside by "a magisterial wave of the hand," or a bombastic display of rhetoric, and much less by a turbid and wild torrent of profanity. Here is the living embodiment in visible, tangible form, of the religion advocated in the Bible, confronting men in the organization of the Christian Church. Here, in this visible form, is what the Bible denominates "the Kingdom of God," set up in the world. This is a stern and solid fact, a standing reality, which no science, philosophy, or logic can deny. It is no mere hypothesis which can be remanded to the sphere of bare possibility, or the doubtful stage of probability, but a genuine, visible, historical living, organized fact. It confronts all alike; the learned and the

unlearned; the rich and the poor; the good and the bad. Here is Christianity with all its effects and influences, actively working, powerfully influencing, and irresistibly agitating the minds of all who come in contact with it. It cannot be ignored. By many it is loved and cherished as the only true religion. They embrace and foster it as the best and truest friend man ever had. They trust in its Author as God incarnate, believing that He carries forward His salutary work of grace in the world by the agency of His Holy Spirit and by means of His word, which, they think, is recorded in the Bible, and that, in this way, He secures a perfect and perpetual happiness for such as receive Him, and so manifests among His intelligent creatures His own ineffable glory.

A greater number of those who hate and disown the Bible as an enemy, charge its followers with credulity, its Author with imposture or self-deception; or rank Christianity with other religions, allowing it, in some some respects, to be better, and in others, worse than they. And all its avowed enemies agree in denying it a divine origin, turning its miracles into myths, its sublime precepts into mere human rules, and its prophecies into frauds, written after the occurrence of the events to which they relate.

Its God, they are bold enough to call a tyrant, a selfish and self-important ruler, and the Bible a mixture of fables, wicked impostures, pious frauds, good moral rules and fictitious stories, compiled for the purpose of deceiving and controlling the ignorant and of enriching a lazy and designing priesthood.

The fact, however, still remains, that the church exists, has existed for ages, wields a mighty influence among men, and, in fact, has been the controlling power in the history of the nations where it has prevailed, and is "the power behind the throne," both as regards legislation and the exercise of executive and judicial authority.*

* It is not forgotten here that Mohammedanism, Buddhism and other religions have, for ages, occupied similar relations in the respective countries where they prevail. It is only necessary, however, to compare England,

In all Christian lands, education has been moulded, fostered, and controlled by its guiding hand, while morality and civilization owe their highest developments to its pervading and elevating influence. So true is this, that even those living in Christian lands who deny its divine origin, are yet under the most solemn obligations to the religion of the Bible for the moral superiority over heathens, which they are fortunate enough to enjoy, as well as for the material comforts and luxuries which are peculiar to Christian nations.

Christianity, in fact, ramifies and modifies, if it does not fully control, every sphere of human life in all places where it prevails. It has ennobled and quickened the intellectual faculties of men and stimulated their inventive genius, enabling them to subdue the wildest and strongest elements of nature and to render them subservient to human happiness and comfort. It has enabled them, by these forces of nature, to bring all nations into near neighborhood. Distance, once an insurmountable barrier to acquaintanceship and commercial and fraternal relations between the nations of the earth, has been almost annihilated. And knowledge is communicated to the farthest corners of the earth with the swiftness of the lightning's flash. By means of these great powers a nation accomplishes in a day what once could scarcely be done in an age or century.*

Germany and the United States, with India, China and other countries where those religions prevail, in order to see that Christianity, as compared with them, is sufficiently elevated to be called divine. Christianity, as its history shows, has uniformly and constantly elevated men and made them happier, while other religions have degraded them. Christianity improves governments and advances human liberty, while other religions render governments tyrannical, human life cheap, and degrading vices almost universal, thus sinking men in the scale of moral and civil virtues. The superiority of Christianity is derived from its adherence to the principles of the Bible.

* But here we may be charged with robbing science of its honors, since these are the results of the labors of students in natural science. It is sufficient to reply that it is science, quickened by Christian influences, that has attained such wonderful results. Because no people under the sun has made similar advancement except those where Christianity prevails.

The present condition of woman in Christian lands, compared with what it formerly was, and now is, in non-Christian lands, affords a striking exhibition of the ameliorating effects of the religion of the Bible.

Formerly, and now, in heathen lands, woman was the slave and beast of burden of men, grovelling in the basest turpitude and wretchedness. Now, in Christian countries, under the benign influence of Bible religion, she has become what God originally made her,—her husband's equal and partner, at once the helper in his business, the joy of his heart, the angel of his household, the original educator of his children, and in general, the guide and moulder of the character of the nations.

All this Christianity has brought about, directly or indirectly, by its proclamation of the teachings of the Bible.

No civilization, however cultivated and refined, either in ancient or modern times, has afforded so many and so great benefits, material, intellectual and spiritual, as that which derives its noblest qualities from the principles of the Bible.

It is evident, therefore, that Christianity, or the church, the organized society and exponent of Christianity, is animated altogether by a different spirit and a different order of life from that of any other religion or any other institution. Its effects are universal, extending to all spheres and conditions of human life. It renews the entire being of the individual, and through the individual lays hold of society, revolutionizing its inward and outward life, and so reaching out in the widest sense it regenerates and sanctifies the State. Accordingly, it so modifies and moulds governments that the highest freedom is secured to the citizens, while at the same time it so magnifies law that the most perfect liberty is enjoyed where it is unfolded in obedience to the powers that be. A comparative study of religions most evidently shows that Christianity is a radical and entire departure from the stand-point of all other religions. And moreover, wherein it differs from others, it improves upon and surpasses them. Thus it appears that wherever the church of

Christ prevails the people enjoy advantages in all respects superior to those of other peoples where it does not prevail.

If this religion was merely human it might be regarded as an advanced stage of evolution, which, in its turn will be surpassed and superseded by another and still higher form of religion. As the "fittest" it will "survive" in the struggle for existence until a fitter appears to push it aside and build on its ruins. This would seem to be quite rational and consistent with the general principles of evolution. But unfortunately for such a theory, it does not account for the radical difference between Christianity and other religions. They have so little in common that it requires a wide stretch of imagination to conceive of either as having been evolved from the other. There is "a missing-link" which the writer of this article has entirely failed to discover.

Christianity is, indeed, human ; as much so as any other religion. But it also claims to be divine, especially in its origin and life. The church is believed, by its members, to be divine-human, constituted outwardly and visibly by men, but quickened and animated inwardly and invisibly by the divine Life and Spirit. And it is on this theanthropic nature of the church that its pre-eminence is supposed to be founded. Its truthfulness and its integrity, together with the great benefits it secures to its votaries, may certainly afford a great probability of its divine origin since no mere human institution ever before conferred like benefits upon men. On the ground of these benefits it makes the claim and on this ground it has sustained its claim for nearly nineteen hundred years. It has, of course, in all its struggles, appealed to the Bible as the source of its doctrines and principles, and proved its celestial and divine character by its effects on men. It regards the Bible as an infallible guide, being the record of a series of divine revelations authenticated by miracles as signs and evidences of the divine inspiration of its prophets and teachers.

Christianity and the church, claiming the Bible to be the Book of God, have ever gone forth into the world teaching and

Credibility of the Bible, Etc.

practicing its principles. The church believes that Jesus Christ is God incarnate; that as such, He taught, wrought miracles, in almost all cases for the happiness of others; that He died as a ransom for sinners; that He overcame death, ascended to heaven and sent forth the Holy Ghost, under whose immediate inspiration she began her organized existence. She believes also that it is her duty, according to the command of Jesus, to go into all the world, disciple all nations, and imitate His example in making men happy. She believes that His miracles are to be imitated as far as possible, and accordingly, she actively engages in every work that tends to alleviate human suffering—to minify their sorrows, and to magnify their happiness.

Whatever she has accomplished in this respect is simply the fruit of faith in the divine character of the Bible, of the divine mission of Jesus, and in the divine purpose for which the Christian religion was instituted. Whether now, the Bible, or Jesus, or Christianity is divine or not, it is certain that the church *believes* them to be divine; and whether Jesus wrought miracles of healing or not, it is certain that the church *believes* that He wrought them. Moreover, it is equally certain that that *belief* is the mainspring of all her endeavors to do the works in the world which, she supposes, God gave her to do.

Hence a contemplation of her works as they appear in contrast and opposition to the works of unbelief, or a view of the fruits of faith contrasted with the fruits of infidelity, may go far to show the divine mission of the church, the supernatural character of Christianity, and the divine origin of the Bible. A clear view of such a contrast will reveal to the honest student the supernatural power of faith on the one hand, and the natural weakness of unbelief on the other.

Before presenting this contrast it may be laid down as an undeniable proposition, that faith in falsehood cannot effect anything good, while it may, and often does accomplish a great deal of evil. If this is true, it follows as a legitimate conclusion that the good accomplished by the church, as a practical

result of faith, is a strong evidence that her faith is founded in truth. And now, since it is evident that faith is the fountain whence issue the streams that irrigate the soil of human nature and quicken it into moral and spiritual life, it must be admitted that faith is founded on something more substantial than myth, more real than imagination, and more reliable than falsehood. For it is very hard to see how faith in a lie, which is a delusion, a deception and a snare, can bring comfort and consolation. On the contrary, universal experience demonstrates that faith in the untruth always, ultimately, ends in disastrous failure. An illustration is furnished in the history of the fall, the result of which is a long and uninterrupted series of failures and calamities which has not yet ended and will, likely, continue to the end of time. Our first parents believed the devil's lie, practically denied the truth of God, and so deprived themselves and their posterity of the divine blessings of righteousness and holiness, and in consequence, misery and death have become the common lot of men. This is true universally. Hence, it is equally true that faith, when practically carried out, and effecting permanent good, must have its foundation in truth. Thus, the faith of the Christian Church, by which so much good has been secured to mankind, is supported by eternal truth. But the faith of the church rests in the teaching of the Bible. She regards it as the record of a divine revelation. She believes in Jesus as the personal revelation of divine truth. She accepts her own mission as divine, and believes that in fulfilling it she must imitate the example of Jesus. And in the effort to do this she secures great happiness to men and relieves them of a great amount of misery. It seems unreasonable, in view of these simple facts, to deny the credibility of the Bible, the divinity of Christ, or the supernatural character of Christianity.

The honest inquirer after truth may find much food for thought and solid reasons for faith in the Bible, in contemplating a few of the achievements of Christianity—the results of faith—and in contrasting them with the fruits of infidelity. A

simple enumeration of their fruits will show the world-wide difference. How very slender the claim of infidels, for our confidence in their theories, is, will abundantly appear, and at the same time the claim of Christianity in favor of the Bible, as being in truth the word of God, will be clearly vindicated.

It may be admitted that infidels, in individual cases, have done noble acts, acts worthy of a better spirit than unbelief inculcates, which proves that their hearts are better than their heads. But by no means do such cases evince any excellency in their system, because they are the exception, not the rule.

Hence, they may be said to occur in spite of their system, as is evident from their infrequency and isolation. For the great mass of men who deny the truth of revelation, consistently with their theory, see no good whatever in acts of charity or good will to others, which involves any kind of sacrifice.

It is entirely otherwise with Christianity. It would be interesting and instructive to trace the history from the beginning. But only a cursory view can here be given. The Apostles traversed the several provinces of the Roman Empire and the influence of their religion on the morals of the people is recorded in 1 Cor., chapter 6, verses 10, 11.

In the following centuries the elevating and ennobling influence of Christianity on society is sharply marked. "As the contrast of heathenism and Christianity, which is no other than that between the old and the new man, was so strongly marked in the different periods of the lives of individuals, so was it also with regard to the relation between Christians, considered collectively, and the corrupt heathen world in which, after the flesh, they still lived, and from out of which, after the spirit, they were already departed. Although in later times, the world, still heathenish in disposition and feelings, had put on the garb of Christianity and it was difficult to distinguish the few genuine and upright Christians from the general mass of nominal ones, yet at this earlier period heathenism stood forth

in all its naked deformity the prevailing party in the world, in distinct opposition to Christianity. To this contrast Origen appeals when he says "Compared with the communities of the people among whom they are placed, the communities of Christians are as lights in the world."*

To this may be added the reluctant acknowledgment of Gibbon in the *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, that in morals, common honesty, patriotism, and especially in their treatment of each other, the Christians far surpassed their heathen and Jewish neighbors.

But in the so-called Dark Ages, perhaps the least prolific in Christian evidence, we may yet find unanswerable reasons for believing in the divine character of Christianity. The church with all her corruption in that period, was yet the nursery of piety, of benevolence, of moral rectitude, and of education and science. For it is certain that these things were fostered and nourished in the bosom of the church. She is sometimes represented as standing in the way and opposing barriers to the progress of science in that age, but this is true only in a relative sense. She did oppose the substitution of science for religious knowledge, and perhaps, in her zeal, often went too far. In the case of Galileo, it now appears, that she did not oppose science as such and took no exception to his discoveries in astronomy. But she objected to any effort of science to unsettle the faith of Christians in the old interpretation of the Bible. It is just what the church has always opposed and does to-day. But as long as science keeps within its own chosen sphere and does not interfere with her prerogative of regulating her spiritual concerns, she has no word of condemnation to utter. Science may make all the discoveries she can, but the church reserves the right to apply them in her own way, if they are in any way to affect her doctrines or cultus. This, the Church of the Middle Ages did, but of course in a less liberal spirit. It must be admitted with sorrow that innumerable and injurious errors marred her beauty in those eventful times.

* Neander's *Hist. Ch. Religion for the First Three Centuries*, p. 152.

But when it is remembered that whole tribes of savages were baptized, almost in a day, and that the church was compelled, by force of circumstances, to carry on her work in the midst of political upheavals, among barbarous and warlike peoples, all of whom had been idolators and unused to submission to any kind of discipline and authority, except that of the sword, the wonder is that she preserved her character and purity as well as she did. The very fact that she maintained her authority and subdued those nomadic hordes, forming them into well-organized nations, and bringing them under the renewing and sanctifying influence of the Gospel, is itself a proof that she was sustained and guided by supernatural power and wisdom. It may be said that her task in the Middle Ages was more difficult than it had been in the primitive, or is in the modern. In the First Ages her enemies were without, and persecution seemed to be an element in her purification. In the present age she contends with enlightened and polished enemies. In the first, the minds of Christians were intently fixed on heavenly things in consequence of persecutions, and so her faith was strengthened. In the modern, the opposition of science and learning forces her to a deeper study of divine things, and thus she comes to a deeper apprehension of revelation and of her divine mission. In this way her faith is fortified against the attacks of polished wickedness and learned unbelief, and so she becomes purified more and more, both in faith and life. But in the Middle Ages her most powerful enemies were within. The peoples received into her bosom were degraded, superstitious, bloodthirsty and ignorant. The pressure brought to bear against her faith and purity was tremendous. Her course of conduct was, necessarily, more legal than evangelical. The proud and restless spirits of barbarians had to be subdued, their unbridled passions to be curbed, their gross idolatry to be broken down. The first requisite to the accomplishment of this herculean task was the exercise of authority.

She had under her tutelage many and diverse peoples. These were the conquerors of the Roman Empire, but under the be-

nign influence of the Gospel she gradually subdued them to the obedience of faith. What if she did become, for a time, a spiritual, and even a political tyranny? Nothing else could subdue the stubborn and warlike spirits of such men in an age when might was felt to be the rule of right, and when the whole of Europe was swarming with untaught savages bent on bloodshed and plunder, in which sanguinary trade they had been trained from their childhood.

What if she did imbibe some of the errors and corruptions of the peoples that were pouring in upon her in overwhelming numbers, threatening to sweep away every vestige of civilization, and to turn the world into a pandemonium of wild beasts let loose to devour and destroy? She met them with the truth, succeeded in civilizing and getting them settled down from a corrupting and seething mass of moral filth and political anarchy into orderly, patriotic, and well-organized nations. And, doubtless, the nations of Europe to-day owe to the Church of the Middle Ages a debt of gratitude, which they can only repay by exercising their influence in spreading the Gospel among the yet pagan nations of the earth. All this was accomplished by a church that had faith in the Bible. And who will venture to deny that the influence which she wielded so successfully was the effect of her faith in the Bible as a direct revelation from God? Or, who will assert that the revelation contained in the Bible did not furnish the means of elevating and civilizing that great mass of degraded humanity? It is easy, indeed, to cry out against a "chained Bible," worshipping of saints, superstition, spiritual power wielding the sword to punish heretics, and to publish all this to the discredit of the Catholic Church. And, alas! these charges must be admitted. But yet all this does not obliterate the inestimable blessings which the Church, in spite of all her deformities and corruptions, conferred on mankind, or the uncontradictable fact that the very course she pursued in the Middle Ages prepared the way for, and led to, the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century. And accordingly, no

age in the Church's history furnishes stronger evidence of the divine presence and wisdom. Nothing short of divine wisdom could have conducted her out of that labyrinth of corruption, error and wickedness, into which she had fallen in consequence of the introduction into her bosom of those vast hordes of idolatrous, vicious, and savage peoples. And if Jesus has ever fulfilled His promise of His perpetual presence in and direction to His Church, it was just in that dark age of conflict with the powers of the world, the flesh and the devil, in which she must inevitably have perished if His presence had been withdrawn. "The gates of Hades" were gaping wide on every side and would have prevailed against her if His word had been untrue. Whoever, therefore, can contemplate with pleasure the Reformation period and behold the hand of God manifested in the regeneration of the nations of Europe, and yet fail to see in it a legitimate birth out of the womb of the age that preceded it, must either be ignorant of the history of that age or blinded by prejudice and fanaticism. He has read history to little purpose who supposes that the Reformation sprang out of the Bible direct, without any historical connection with the Church of the past.

No genuine Christian, indeed, can close his eyes to the evils of popery and the corruptions of the Roman Church, or fail to bewail them with sadness; but he ought not to forget the great things God has done for mankind through her instrumentality. It is to be remembered, also, that the great leading doctrines of the Reformation and of the Evangelical Church of this age have been handed down to us from that Church and that age.

May we not go further and assert that the foundation principles of the noblest institutions of our own times were laid in the Middle Ages and under the fostering care of that Church? We are not pleading for the Roman Church or for popery. We are not unmindful of the real abuses, corruptions, barbarous practices, and degrading superstitions, which disgraced the Christian name, and which loudly called for "a reformation in head

and members." With heart-felt sorrow these terrible charges must be admitted. But the fact remains that protests, efforts at reform, organized attempts to purify the church and State, are apparent in the history of the times, and all arose within the bosom of the Church. Benevolent enterprises for relieving the wants of the poor, the sufferings of the sick, and of all who were in need, were founded and fostered by the Church. And these have come down to our times only to be enlarged and improved. Missionary work was carried on with zeal and self-sacrificing devotion such as is worthy of imitation.

Many of those magnificent institutions of learning, now the pride and glory of the nations of Europe, centres of light and knowledge for the world,—those grand old universities,—owe their origin to the love of learning and religion, which was developed in the Church of the Middle Ages.

What now, we may ask, could lead to such developments in those ages of darkness, revolution, bloody wars and infidel opposition, but the enlightening, ennobling and purifying influences of the Gospel? For, notwithstanding the filthy excrescences that so sadly marred the beauty of the Church, she still held the Bible in honor, believed its promises, taught its heavenly precepts, and was assuredly not wholly forsaken by the divine Spirit. The Bible was studied and taught by a portion of the priesthood, and this teaching kept alive the flame of religious life and devotion.

The Reformation, with all its beneficial results, the grandest revolution, perhaps, in the world's history, certainly the grandest movement of modern times, took its rise in the bosom of the Church, carried with it all that was true and good in the Church, and, under the name of Protestantism, constituted the Church *reformed*. The papacy, with the ecclesiastical hierarchy, from and after that time, may be called the abandoned shell of the true Catholic Church, which was useful in its time; but, like Judaism of old, having served its purpose, it was cast off, to fall into decay, or is, perhaps, kept for some future purpose, while the Church has gone forward, in its new dress, on

a higher stage of action, towards renewed conquests in the world, to improve refine, and elevate the civilizations of the nations.

Since the Reformation the march of the Church has been onward and upward. "Progressive Conservatism" may be said to be her watchword.

Endeavoring all the while to foster and cherish everything that has permanent value, she has not hesitated to push forward her conquests into all spheres of life, and into all parts of the world, with energy and zeal. She appropriates to sacred purposes, everything, and every discovery, that may aid her in coming to a deeper apprehension of the teaching of the Bible, or that she can render subservient to her great work of saving sinners. She has laid hold of all the resources furnished for her use, and consecrated them to the spread of the Gospel. All improvements in art, and the discoveries in philosophy and science that are of value, she has dedicated to religious purposes, and, as far as practicable, made them subservient to the advancement of her spiritual concerns.

Our great schools of learning are fostered and supported by the Church, and even the common schools, though not under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are the offspring of her teaching, and in a great measure moulded by her influence. This appears in the text-books, and in the Christian characters of the majority of the teachers. And, however unbelief has attempted to control our school system, and reduce it in all its details to mere secular and material interests, yet Christianity maintains its controlling influence. So that the moral and religious teachings of the Bible increasingly continue to modify and elevate the standard of education. A visit to almost any common school, or attendance at school exhibitions or institutes, will convince any one that both teachers and scholars are more or less under the powerful influence of Christian training.

Or, again, if any one will study the history of discovery and invention, he will find that nearly all great and original additions to our knowledge, and helps to our convenience and

comfort, came from the active minds and industrious hands of Christian scholars and Christian workmen.

And who are the leading statesmen whose hands hold the reins of government, whose wisdom directs the destinies of the nations, but Christians, whose wisdom is derived from the Bible, and who reverence the Church as their spiritual mother?

It is cheerfully admitted that an occasional discovery has been made and an invention found out by one who had no faith in the Bible. But it is the exception, not the rule. And even here it may be claimed that such are, unconsciously to themselves, perhaps, under the influence of Christianity, and owe their most valuable attainments to its teachings. For, as previously intimated, the principles of the Bible exercise a leavening power, even in the minds of those who avowedly reject it; and especially of those who neither intentionally accept or reject it.

But once more: if we enumerate those institutions that are specifically founded in charity, and have for their object the benefit of the poor and the needy, and ask ourselves whence these derive their origin, the universal answer must be, "From the Bible." The Church, believing in its teachings, and animated by its spirit, imitating, as far as possible, the example of her divine Leader, has, in these institutions, made the attempt to relieve the necessities of all classes of unfortunate people; and by relieving their physical wants, she finds an avenue to their higher spiritual nature, and pours in the "balm of Gilead" to heal their sin-sick souls. Accordingly, under the benign influence of the Gospel, she erects and supports asylums for the blind, the deaf and the dumb, where the victims of these sad calamities are, in a measure, relieved from the monotony of their otherwise isolated life. Thus many a ray of light has found its way into the souls of the blind, through the sense of touch, which they could not enjoy through that of sight. Books printed in raised letters afford them the opportunity of reading, and in this way their loss of sight is partially supplied.

And so again, the deaf and dumb are taught to communicate

with their friends by means of the written and printed page, and thus, while doomed to perpetual silence, they nevertheless have some compensation through the medium of their hands and eyes.

Again, the destitute sick and injured are kindly cared for, their sufferings relieved, their hearts comforted, and consolation and hope are offered to cheer them in the hour and article of death.

The hungry and naked are fed and clothed, orphans provided for, and the outcast, the degraded and the abandoned sought out and won back to a life of purity and happiness.

Thus the Church of Christ, following His example, and obeying the precepts and directions of the Bible, has done all these things for the amelioration and elevation of the condition of men—things which human nature alone never prompted men to do.

Time would fail us to tell of all her achievements in heathen lands; of her conquests, even in our own day, and of her increasing power and influence for good in all lands where she has had opportunity to unfurl the banner of the cross, and teach the forgiveness of sin and the hope of immortality. All this she has done, and she still goes forward in the blessed work with renewed zeal and unwearied energy from day to day, bringing light and happiness "to earth's millions of sinning, sorrowing and suffering souls," and cheering them with the hope of heaven. So much for the Bible and its teachings.

Now what has infidelity done? What influence has it exerted for the welfare of men? Where are the colleges it has founded? Where are the deaf and dumb asylums it supports? The hospitals it has provided? Where are its houses of refuge for the abandoned? How many missionaries has it sent out to enlighten the ignorant, to lift the burden from the weary shoulder, or to speak words of peace to the troubled soul, or of hope to those in despair?

Alas! it has done nothing to promote, but much to destroy human happiness, and to overwhelm men in despair. It has

founded no institutions to benefit mankind. It has sent out no missionaries. It has built no churches. It has tried to upset the faith of humble Christians in the only religion that has ever offered peace and salvation to sinful men. It has tried to hurl Jehovah from the throne of the world in order to rid its votaries of moral responsibility. It has tried to bring reproach upon the Bible, and to discredit it as a divine revelation. It has sought to cast odium upon the Church by holding up unworthy members to contempt, as examples of Christian faith, and by charging their sins to their religion. It has attempted to destroy everything in religion that affords hope and comfort to dying men.

Behold its fruits in Russian Nihilism, German Socialism, French Communism! These exhibit their characters in a restless chafing under restraint, and consequent overt acts of insubordination,—rebellion against good government, dark conspiracies against the peace and prosperity of the social organism—attempts at regicide—indiscriminate assassination—licentiousness, libertinism—lowering, and, indeed, destroying the standard of morals in relation to the marital bond—turning loose the vilest passions—opening the flood-gates of the most abominable vices—leaving men and women free to cohabit promiscuously like the brutes that perish—and in giving free reins to brutal practices and unbridled lusts.

Under the shadow of such a system, murder, arson and adultery might impudently stalk through every land unchallenged and without restraint.

In the language of the great Chalmers, therefore, it can be truly said that:—"Infidelity gives nothing in return for what it takes away." What, then, is it worth? Everything to be valued has a compensating power. Not a blade of grass that withers, or the ugliest weed that is flung away to rot and die, but reproduces something. Nothing in nature is barren. Therefore everything that is or seems opposed to nature cannot be true; it can only exist in the shape that a diseased mind imparts to one of its coinages. Infidelity is one of the coinages,

—a mass of base money that won't pass current with any heart that loves truly, or any head that thinks correctly, and infidels are poor, sad creatures; they carry about them a load of dejection and desolation, not the less heavy that it is invisible." Or, if visible at all, it is in the outward evil which it effects against mankind; for infidelity is evil in all its fruits. But the effects of Christianity are just the opposite, as may be seen in the following beautiful tribute by H. I. Rose: "We live in the midst of blessing till we are utterly insensible of their greatness, and of the source from which they flow. We speak of our civilization, our arts, our freedom, our laws, *and forget entirely how large a share of all is due to Christianity.* Blot Christianity out of the page of man's history, and what would his laws have been?—what his civilization? Christianity is mixed up with our very being and our daily life; there is not a familiar object round us which does not wear its mark; not a being or a thing which does not wear a different aspect, because the light of Christian hope is on it; not a law which does not owe its truth and gentleness to Christianity; not a custom which cannot be traced, in all its holy and healthful parts, to the Gospel."

The contrast which thus appears between the fruits of Bible doctrine, on the one hand, and of infidelity, on the other, is of such a character, and so great, that any one contemplating for the first time, would involuntarily conclude that one was from heaven and the other from hell. But we are so accustomed to it that we fail to appreciate the heaven-wide difference until our attention is specially called to it. A fair and honest consideration of this contrast, however, will convince any unprejudiced mind of *the credibility of the Bible.*

VI.

THE CHRISTMAS SEASON.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

BY REV. M. KIEFFER, D.D.

THE Gospel of St. John i. 19-34: "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, what then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then they said unto him, who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said unto him, why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John answered them saying, I baptize with water, but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not: he it is, who, coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

"The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove,

and it abode upon him. And I knew him not, but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me : Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God. . . .”

The more we meditate upon the realities of our holy religion the more deeply sensible do we become that they can be apprehended properly only in their unity. This was verified and illustrated in the previous lesson. There it appeared clearly that Christ vindicated John's character solely on the ground of a oneness of life and of interest. Those who are members of His body are as dear to Him as the apple of His own eye, and He will own them as His in life and death, and will vindicate them before the assembled multitudes of the Last Great Day.

On the very same ground does John, according to the Gospel for this day, give his testimony in honor of his Lord. This, that is now before us, occurred immediately after our Saviour's temptation in the wilderness, His first great victory ; it is therefore the introduction to His public ministry. That which we considered last took place some time after, when our Saviour was making His third missionary tour, through Galilee. The question may then be asked : Why did the Church reverse this chronological order when she came to determine and settle the order of her worship ? The reason is obvious ; the inspired Scriptures simply give the record of facts, but the thinking and worship of the church must needs follow the law of life in Christ Jesus. We love Him, because He first loved us, and we cannot speak to His honor and praise until by His Spirit our spirits are placed in their proper attitude before God. “What think ye of Christ ?” is indeed an important question ; but we cannot answer it properly till we know what Christ thinks of us. When He is internally revealed to us, and we come to stand consciously in His love, then with Peter and John we can answer and confess : “Thou art the Christ, the Son of God.”

The relation of John the Baptist to Christ is peculiar ; yet

it has a general significance. Hence we first consider that relation as defined by himself, secondly the import of his record, or testimony concerning the Person of Christ, and finally the advent preparation, or what is meant by preparing the way of the Lord.

I. It is implied by the readiness of the Baptist to answer the questions of the priests and Levites sent from Jerusalem, that the Sanhedrim is the legally constituted body to determine and settle religious questions for the people. Their authority is acknowledged. Hence we might naturally suppose that John would first of all justify his course of conduct by giving the history of his life by naming his parents, and by showing his credentials as a divinely and regularly commissioned prophet. But his life is so completely hid with Christ in God as to leave self entirely out of view. Knowing that there is a prevailing opinion that he might be the Messiah, "he confessed, and denied not: I am not the Christ." If I were to say that I am *He*, thus exalting self, and thus expecting to find life, I would lose it, for it would be a denial of Him who is the Christ, and of the kingdom of heaven, which I have declared to be at hand. According to prophecy, it is expected that Elias, who did not die, but was translated—taken to heaven in a chariot of fire—will return as the forerunner of Christ, preaching and baptizing: "Art thou he?" He answered, "I am not." I am not the Elias you mean, I am not Elijah the Tishbite.

Once more, according to our sacred books, it is expected (Matt. xv. 14) that Jeremias, or some other one of the prophets will come to preach and cleanse the nation with the water of purification: art thou he? Again we hear the emphatic answer, "I am not." Who then art thou, that we may give an answer to them that sent us? According to the Scriptures, no one coming as thou hast come, has authority to baptize, except the Messiah, Elias, or that other prophet. If thou art neither one of these, why dost thou preach repentance, and why dost thou baptize? Now we are done with negatives, and are favored with the positive answer: "I am the voice of one crying in the

wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias." . . . "I baptize with water; but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; He it is, who coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." That defines his relation to Christ. He is the connecting link between the past and the present—the conscious medium through which the Old Testament revelations come to their full significance in the Person and Kingdom of Christ. John's voice is not that of any one prophet, nor of any particular past age; but is the voice of *one* national life (that of God's covenant people of *all* past times), of the *one* nation in the wilderness of nations, crying, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." O, ye Pharisees, ye priests and Levites, this voice is but the true echo of God's voice, from the consciousness of the better national life in which ye stand. Know ye not that God has been with your nation from its commencement to the present time, going before His people as their pillar of cloud by day, and their pillar of fire by night, that He has spoken through the Patriarchs and prophets, that He has revealed Himself in visions and by many infallible signs? The entire past revelation comes to its full utterance in Him, who is now in your midst; yet Him ye know not. I did not know Him either as the promised Messiah, till He who commissioned me to baptize told me that *this is He*. I saw the Spirit descend upon Him like a dove, and abide upon Him. And I heard a voice from heaven saying: This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. "Therefore I said He is preferred before me, because He was before me." John's relation to the Lord then is twofold. He, as the representative of the true theocracy, as the conscious medium of its utterance, is the true friend of the Bridegroom, and goes before Him to introduce Him to the bride. Or, in other words, he is the conscious medium, through whom, as their representative, the previous prophets of the Lord stand in the real prophetic succession.

In such sense, we think, he is much more than a forerunner, or messenger at the side of many other messengers. He is the

Bridegroom's friend in the sense that he represents all previous preparations made for His advent. Interesting relationship! But this is not yet the most intimate bond of union between the Baptist and his Lord. He is a living witness also that the Lord is the Son of God, and the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. This implies an internal relationship more intimate even than that of special prophetic office. True, the dispensation of the Spirit has not yet fully come. The Holy Ghost has not been given, as on the day of Pentecost. Yet that Spirit was present even before Christ's time as the Spirit of revelation, at least sporadically, and when Christ was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended upon Him as the Spirit of anointing; and we think it is not saying too much that the Baptist partook, in some measure, of the same illumining influence. Just as before intimated, when Peter made his memorable confession, the Saviour said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." So here doubtless the testimony of John that Christ is the Son of God cannot be of a mere outward character, but must have proceeded from an internal revelation of the same Spirit that abode upon the Lord in the form of an outward symbol. By whatever term this grace may be designated, "prevenient," or actually "regenerating," it admits at least of a comparison with that which is given in full measure to its happy subjects in the dispensation of the Spirit. Such comparison was instituted by the Saviour when He said, with reference to John, "Nevertheless he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." From this we may fairly infer that whilst his life belonged properly to the Old Testament Dispensation, nevertheless he was so far enlightened by the Spirit as to confess that Christ is the Son of God from a sense of personal adoption. We can say at least that this is so potentially. The possibility to be actualized in the near future. Be this as it may, the twofold relationship of the Baptist to his Lord, here named, has real significance for the Church for all coming

time. *Her* voice is that of one crying in the wilderness of this world: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord;" and her testimony has ever been: "He is the Son of God." That is the voice of Christians in their complex union, and as individuals, they are "living epistles of God to be seen and read of all men." So Christian was John's record, or testimony, that all Christians must say: It is *our* record, it is our testimony: "He is God's Son. He is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

Noticing, as we cast our eyes over the lesson, that there is a two-fold testimony—the first as given in answer to the questions of those in authority, and the other in the presence of a multitude of people including the disciples—we proceed to inquire into

II. The essential import of that which is witnessed, or recorded. Here it seems at the very outset that every conceivable error in regard to the Person of Christ is anticipated. Is there any doubt as to His essential divinity? Here we are expressly told that He is the "Son of God"—a form of expression, in Jewish theology, which means that He is equal with God, and consequently that He is God. This was the main ground of the accusation of the Jews against Him; namely, that He claimed to be the Son of God, thus making Himself equal with Him. His pre-existence, as declared by Himself in the words: "Before Abraham was, I am," is *here* witnessed in the words, "After me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for He was before me." John was six months older than Jesus; how then could this testimony be true except on the ground that the latter is God? And further, who but God could baptize with the Holy Ghost? A man divinely commissioned may baptize in the *name* of God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but no mere man can baptize *with* the Holy Ghost.

Here the record of John is in perfect harmony with that of the inspired Scriptures throughout. There is a general presumption in favor of the divinity of Christ in the whole structure of

the Bible. Everywhere He is represented as more than man. Indeed, if Christ is not a Divine Person, the language in regard to Him in the Scriptures would be calculated to make a false impression, and lead us astray. How, under such hypothesis, could we understand such Scriptures as the following? John i. 1, "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God." John iii. 13, "And no man has ascended up to heaven, *but he that came down from heaven*, even the Son of man which is in heaven." John iii. 31, "He that cometh from above is above all." John vi. 38, "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." John xvi. 28, "I came forth from the Father, and am come in the world." 1 John iv. 2, 3, "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." These are advent texts. Many more might be quoted of the same import. Arians try to weaken the force of these passages by their efforts to prove that notwithstanding the Lord's pre-existence, He is nevertheless a creature—the first and oldest of all creatures. But this is proven to be all in vain by the positive Scriptural declarations that He is God. Rom. ix. 5, "And of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for evermore." John i. 1, "The word was God." Socinians say, "was made God," an idea which has not the least countenance from the Bible, because God's attributes are incommunicable; He cannot give His essential glory, or communicate His nature to a creature. The very idea is contrary both to reason and to Scripture. In Hebrews we read, in reference to the Son: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom." The design of the writer here is to show the superiority of Christ to the angels. Throughout the Old Testament He is called Jehovah. This name is used to distinguish Him as the true God from the heathen gods. Divine attributes are ascribed to Him, such as *eternity, omni-*

presence, omniscience, omnipotence, immutability, etc. (See John xvii. 8; Mich. v. 2; John iii. 13; Matt. xxiii. 20; Matt. xviii. 20; Matt. ii. 27; John ii. 24; Jerem. xvii. 10; Rev. ii. 23; Heb. xiii. 8.)

Thus, too, divine works are ascribed to Him. All things were made by Him, and by Him they are preserved. And thus also divine worship belongs to Him. The angels worship Him—and it behooveth every human knee to bow before Him and every tongue to confess that He is the Lord to the glory of God. That is the testimony of John, that Messiah is very God. He testifies further that in one person He is very man. As a man he had doubtless some knowledge of Him for years; he knew Him as the son of Mary and Joseph. Such knowledge does not contradict the statement that he was careful to make that he did not know Him as the promised Messiah, because he learns this fact by a special revelation. He conversed with Christ, as with a man; he went with Him into the water, baptized Him and came with Him out of the water; he saw the Spirit, like a dove, descend, and abide upon Him, and now he addresses his countrymen, saying: "There standeth one among you whom ye know not, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." This cannot be a theophany merely for a moment or an hour. He whom I baptized with water, and who now standeth among you is very man, as well as God; he is Emanuel—God with us. This testimony is corroborated by the whole history of His life—no life more divine, and yet no life so truly human. There is no human characteristic that He did not possess, and there is no condition or law of human life that was not exemplified in His Person. Hence the Scriptures abound in sayings that have reference to His humanity. Matt. i. 1, "Christ Jesus, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham." Matt. viii. 20, "The Son of man hath not where to lay His head." More than sixty times He calls Himself the "son of man." Luke ii. 52, "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." John i. 14, "And the word was made *flesh* and dwelt among us."

1 Tim. ii. 5, "One God, and one mediator between God and men, the *man* Christ Jesus." Heb. ii. 13, "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil (15) and deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (16) For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. (17) Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be like unto his brethren." "He was touched with the feeling of our infirmities, being tempted in all points like as we are." "He was a *man* of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

Finally the record of John is, that Christ is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and that He baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. We need not ask whether he has here reference to the particular prophecy of Isaiah (53) which describes the Saviour's sufferings and death, and His lamb-like patience and innocency; or whether he has special reference to the Paschal Lamb. Christ is the great antitype, the ideal to which the divinely instituted offerings generally of the Old Testament, have a typical relation. The time of fulfillment has now come. God has made *His* great offering. He has given His Son, who bears and takes away the world's sin. The once for all sacrifice is now to be made. Christ becomes the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world. The fact of redemption, answering in full to man's need of the same! It is to this that the Baptist as a true witness here calls attention, not as to a phenomenon, but as to a great reality to be made effectual for each person through the Personal Redeemer. Hence he is careful to say: "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." This looks not only to Calvary, where the blood of the Lamb is shed, a death for sin; but to the coming up out of the grave also, for our justification, an ascension into

heaven, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. It looks to the birthday of the Church, the genesis of the new creation in Christ Jesus. But the genesis looks also to its exodus. Hence the progressive form is used in both instances: "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," "the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." The sufferings and death of Christ do not take away the world's sin as by magic. Not the merit of suffering in itself considered is availing for our salvation. The blood of Christ could not cleanse from sin, if He had remained forever in the state of the dead. The Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world must not only be beheld on Calvary, where it was slain; it must be seen also where the seer of the New Covenant saw it, in heaven, in the very heart of God; it is His Lamb. It is not enough that the fountain be opened "for sin and uncleanness;" the life-giving and healing waters flowing therefrom must in some way be made accessible to us. There must be a baptism in these waters. They are objectively present in the sanctuary, that is, in the Church: they flow in divinely-ordained channels; and here, as in the beginning, the Spirit moves upon the great deep. Here Christ baptizes with the Holy Ghost. He baptizes into His own body, so that His blood, which is His life, becomes availing for our complete salvation.

This is the wondrous advent way of the Lord. It is the way in which His kingdom comes. It is the way in which His mystical body grows. It is the way by which those who are taken up as integral parts of this body are cleansed from their sins, and healed of their infirmities. It is the way of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and complete redemption. It is the process by which the divine in the human gives it life and immortality. It is the Lord's way of saving men by baptizing with the Holy Ghost. It is not yet ended. So the requirement to

III. Prepare the way of the Lord and to make His paths strait is still in force. It may seem like a contradiction that men are called upon to prepare the way of salvation, since it

has been wrought out, and is objectively at hand. It is like the command: "Prepare to meet thy God," when we know that God is with us, and that we cannot escape His presence. We know what that means; namely, that we should prepare to meet God in the judgment of the last day to render an account of the deeds done in the body. That day will come whether we obey the command or not. So the salvation is present; it is offered, whether we accept it or neglect it. But how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? The question is that of personal responsibility. We cannot be mistaken as to what is here meant by "the way of the Lord." We are aware that the word "way," or "ways" has different significations. We read of the ways of wisdom, the ways of a wise man and the ways of a foolish man, the broad way and the narrow way. So we read of God's thoughts and ways. These may be in the deep of His own infinite being, or they may follow the course of time. They are as high above our ways and our thoughts as the heavens are above the earth. The terms here mean the general mode of the divine activity. God as person is active in willing and thinking. But according to the Scriptures, there is a peculiar kind of Divine activity, a peculiar mode of dealing with the children of men, which is, in a special sense, called the "way of the Lord." Thus in Proverbs xvi. 17, we read of "a highway for the upright to depart from evil." Isaiah (xi. 16) speaks of "a highway prepared for the remnant of God's people." And again he says (xxxv. 8), "A highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness, *the redeemed shall walk there*, and the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." We read in Isaiah xl. 3, "Make in the desert a highway for our God."

By comparing these prophecies with the New Testament Scriptures which refer to the same subject, we learn that this highway is the way of salvation; as for example Acts xvi. 17: "These men are the servants of the most High God, which

show unto us the way of salvation." See also Luke xix. 9: "This day is salvation come to this house." Christ had come to the house of Zaccheus, and He is the salvation. So Simeon, when he saw Christ, blessed the Lord, because his eyes had seen His salvation. And the Saviour calls Himself "The way, the truth and the life." *It is the Lord's way*, and, as said by the prophet Isaiah, it is *prepared*. It behooves us, therefore, especially in this day of confused ideas, to take heed that we rightly apprehend the meaning of the divine call: "prepare ye the way of the Lord." It does not mean that as nations, families, or individuals, we have of ourselves either the inclination or the strength to do the least thing to draw the Lord toward us. "The carnal mind is enmity against God," and as of ourselves we cannot think a good thought or speak a good word. The Lord loves all men, and wants to come in unto them. "Behold," we hear Him say "I stand at the door and knock, if any man will open the door I will come in unto him, and sup with him, and he with Me." In like manner He would come in to families and nations. Yet He will not force His way contrary to man's will. And if man cannot will to open the door, if he has no inclination to do so, not knowing Him that standeth without, what then can we say? Is any one under obligation to do that which he *cannot* do? That seems a great mystery indeed; a divine way objectively "prepared," yet man called upon to prepare the way. But we have seen that the salvation that has come to us is human, as well as divine. It comes to us in the way of light and love: yea, not only the light and love of a Divine Person have touched us; but Christ, who is as truly human as He is divine, and whose anointing by the Spirit is the anointing of humanity, reveals Himself in the domain of the human consciousness with no less power than that by which He made the worlds. Why should we here, in the usual fashion, make for ourselves a difficulty by separating the subjective from the objective? We don't do so in the sphere of the natural. When we are told that we are in the natural, and that it is in us, we understand it. And when

we are told that the winter season is near, and that a storm is approaching, or that friends are coming, company is to be enjoyed, we don't perplex ourselves about the deep mystery underlying all this. We hear the call, "prepare," and it has for us no uncertain sound. So precisely should it be in the sphere of grace. Here Christ has come internally, subjectively, as well as objectively. The external call is internal as well. If we have no power to will and do the good, He is that power in us. If we are in darkness, He is our light; if we are in sin He is our salvation; if we are dead, He is our life.

John called the Jews to prepare the way of the Lord by repentance and baptism. To them that did repent and believe He gave the power to become the sons of God. That power is in and with us; the Lord commands us to work out our salvation whilst He works within us to will and to do of His good pleasure. He gives faith, He gives "repentance unto salvation just because He baptizeth with the Holy Ghost; He baptizeth into His life, into His death;" hence He is to us complete redemption, since He ever liveth in heaven, and is ever coming nearer to us, that we may be with Him forever in the mansions of glory which He has prepared for them that love Him.

VII.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

Read before the Cliosophic Society, Lancaster, Pa.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D.

Most persons in this happy country of ours, including the ladies, and even school-boys and girls, are tolerably well acquainted with the Constitution of the United States; for if they are not, it is not because they have not had opportunities to know something about it. We have been quite fortunate, certainly, in having numerous expounders, from the great Webster down to the village schoolmaster and the village weekly newspaper. The fact is, we are here, on this side of the ocean, all sovereigns, and why should we not also be statesmen, and know something about the Magna Charta of our rights and privileges, in this the best governed country on our planet.

We do not, therefore, in these circumstances, surrounded by such a great cloud of witnesses, regard it as presumptuous to attempt to write about the Constitution, nor improper to ask this learned circle to give their opinions about such a weighty matter.

The merits of the great organic law of this country are not unknown to fame, even among those who do not enjoy its benefits; they are world-renowned, as the Germans say. But when we come to examine them more carefully, we will be reluctantly compelled to acknowledge that they are not so original as we sometimes suppose; and that therefore we do not deserve so much credit for them as our Fourth-of-July orators would have us to believe. We hear a great deal about the connection of its parts, and the checks inserted at all prominent points to

prevent one part of the government from interfering with another, so that law and order may be maintained and the freedom of the people respected. Thus, the President of the United States is Commander-in-Chief of our armies, and carries the sword; but the House of Representatives carries the purse, and must vote the money to carry on war, else the sword in the hand of the President amounts to nothing, and neither the army nor navy can accomplish anything. But this is nothing new, because the principle that the people must vote supplies—carry the purse—was established in England during their long contentions with the house of the Stuarts,—long before we existed as a nation. The English House of Commons, who represent the people in this respect, have just as much to say in regard to war or peace as the popular branch of our own government.

But whilst the one-man power must be carefully guarded and kept from running into tyranny, the danger from the opposite extreme of a pure democracy, where a mere majority of the representatives of the people may become just as oppressive and tyrannical as any absolute monarch. In this country they may vote money and war, but the Senate and the President must endorse their action, or it becomes a nullity. So it is, also, and has been in England, where the House of Lords can check and restrain any disorderly or lawless proceedings in the Lower House.

In the same way the Judiciary department of our government, vested in the Supreme Court, has a function to perform in *particular cases*, to pronounce a law of Congress invalid, where it conflicts with the Constitution. The same is the case in England.

Much credit is sometimes claimed for our excellent Constitution, because it allows no room for privileged classes, for titles of nobility, and the language used seems to imply that they were abolished here in America; but the feudal system can hardly be said even to have had an existence in this country, and it would be certainly a mistake to say that it was here

abolished. When our government was formed we had no nobility, and scarcely any person wished to have such an institution. The article in the Constitution that forbade it, therefore, involved no loss or sacrifice of any kind, and stands there as a mere *brutum fulmen* against its existence elsewhere or hereafter. As a protection against the slow growth of such an institution, it can scarcely amount to anything; because here would be the last place in the world where it would likely take root and grow. Most probably our forefathers, holding in vivid recollection the trouble occasioned by an aristocratic class in the history of the past in other countries, had their fears that it might in some way be smuggled in by their descendants, and so from patriotic motives put an effectual barrier in the way of its introduction for all time to come. It was Divine Providence, who orders and directs the affairs of nations no less than of individuals, that brought about such a conjuncture of affairs in this land, that the founders of our government, without any considerable sacrifice of feelings or interests, had the honor conferred upon them of pronouncing the death-knell of an element in human society, which, however useful in its place and time, cannot be regarded any longer as in harmony with the progress of the world's civilization.

They did, however, in fact, admit a relic of the feudal system into their great and immortal work by legalizing slavery where it was, and so giving rise to a kind of landed aristocracy. We all know why they did so. They simply could not help themselves. They, moreover, probably had no idea of the mischief to which it would lead in after-times. Had they foreseen the result of their compromise, and been prepared to make the necessary sacrifice, which would have been a real one in their day, they would have been wise—more than humanly wise, perhaps—and would have saved their country much trouble, long discussion and bitter strife, all ending in civil war and bloody carnage.

Our noble Constitution, as we all know, left no room for the union of church and state, and this has always been regarded

as one of its many excellencies. It involved, however, no sacrifice. Probably few, if any, thought of establishing a national church in this country. The circumstances of the people, divided into numerous religious sects, as they were, precluded every idea of the kind. History was advancing, and it was already giving its verdict against religious establishments. The framers of the Constitution took things as they found them, and simply expressed the voice of Providence in the matter. The article forbidding "an establishment of religion" was, however, a powerful testimony against such establishments the wide world over. The example here set, without any sacrifice or loss on our part, we have reason to believe, was the beginning of a movement which shall not end until the state and church in other countries shall stand each on its own proper foundation, and give each other mutual support without mixture, confusion, or a false outward mechanical union. The word "dis-establishment," employed to describe this movement, is coming into vogue.

But was the formation of our Constitution simply the adoption of certain principles of government already acknowledged? Certainly not, we reply; for if that had been the case, it would have been simply a figure-head, and, in itself considered, would have been no advance in history; and as a mere documentary record would have had no influence in the development of our national life. It sought to embody all those truths which the Declaration of Independence had declared were self-evident—at least in this country. But it embodied a number of other things which were not so self-evident in those days, not even to Mr. Jefferson himself, after he came back from France with his radical views and found the new Constitution in full bloom—the work of thirty-eight brave men, with Washington at their head.

When England gave up the contest with her American colonies as fruitless, she declared them all—including little Delaware and Rhode Island—free, sovereign and independent states, which meant that each one might now become a little nation by itself. Articles of Confederation had been adopted

among themselves for mutual protection and defense. But the confederation was a mere rope of sand, as it was called, with little or no authority in it. What was necessary in these circumstances was an organic law which should bring these little sovereignties together and form them into a nation. This was the herculean task to which the framers were required to address themselves; and it was something that not only required a sacrifice of feeling, but demanded new light. A step must be made to a higher plane of national life. They studied the republics of antiquity, the fierce democracies of Athens and Rome, the republics of Italy, Switzerland and Holland; but these were all unsatisfactory. They were well adapted for small communities, but not for such a country as this, nor for the nation that was to be. There was little unity at first in the convention. The centrifugal force was strong, and the love for the little sovereignties was quite as ardent in those early days as it was in later times. Some of the members felt like taking up their hats and going home. A good many delegates from the different sovereignties did not come to the convention at all, and, of course, did not bring their hats with them. From New York only one came, Alexander Hamilton, who, however, was a host in himself, like the Scottish chief whose pibroch whistle was worth a thousand men.

From Virginia only three presented themselves, but Washington and Madison were among them. Pennsylvania sent eight delegates; New Jersey, four; Delaware, five; and Maryland, three; so that from these four last-mentioned States, clustering around Philadelphia, there were twenty out of the thirty-eight members who signed the great instrument of American freedom when it was finished. It was not likely that distance or the difficulty of travelling in those days prevented all of the colonies from being more fully represented. Fear and distrust, no doubt, had much to do in the premises. The magnitude and difficulty of the work, in fact, were sufficient to keep ordinary men out of the convention, or to drive them out after they once got in. The convention, however, did not break up. They only thought of doing so.

And now here comes in the beautiful incident handed down by history, telling us how the framers got out of their dilemma and reached the shore after floundering about for weeks on the waves of unprofitable discussion ; how Dr. Franklin proposed that the convention should pray to God for light and help ; how Bishop White came in every morning and led the convention in prayer on bended knees, with the exception of the Quaker, who stands looking on with his hat on his head, as seen in the picture ; and then how everything went well after that ; how they, with much unanimity, finished their work, signed their names to it, and sent it out to the country for adoption or rejection.

The framers of the Constitution were, for the most part, Englishmen as well as Americans ; hence, whilst they detested British tyranny, they were not ignorant of the merits of the English Constitution, and not unwilling to engraft into their own work its best features, leaving out only its defects, or parts which did not suit in the new government about to be established. The common law of England had generally been adopted in this country, and it seemed to be a logical necessity that the organic law should be similar in both cases. In the great stress that was brought to bear on the convention, the centrifugal force had to yield and come into proper relation with the centripetal. State sovereignty, as something paramount, went to the wall, and the union was effected. Washington, Franklin, Hamilton and Madison, by their great moral strength, prevailed ; a free government was established, with a head and ample power to keep it from falling to pieces at the first strain it might have to experience. We then became a nation, a union, and the foundation of our greatness was thus laid. Here in a few men the victory was won, and a new creation in history made its appearance—a free, democratic government, with a concentration of power for its own preservation as great as in any other government in the world, involving a “church without a bishop, and a state without a king,” in some good sense at least. It was not born in the “Mayflower,” nor in North Carolina, but in Philadelphia. The triumph, however, of

a few individual great men was over that which was *local, limited and particular*, in favor of that which was *general and universal*, had to be also the work of the people of the thirteen independent sovereignties before it could become an established historical fact. The new Constitution did not at first call forth any very general enthusiasm among the people. It, in fact, led to the formation of two particular parties,—the Federalists and the anti-Federalists,—the latter maintaining that too much power was lodged in the Federal government, and might prove dangerous to the liberties of the people. Patrick Henry in Virginia brought all the powers of his great eloquence against its adoption; Jefferson was not satisfied; Virginia and New York stood aloof for a while. But in the course of about one year the majority of the people in eleven States adopted it, and not long afterward the remaining two followed their example. Washington considered it the best Constitution that could be formed for this country under the circumstances. The new government went into operation on the 4th of March, 1789, with Washington as its first President.

The opposition to such a government showed itself in two such respectable States as Massachusetts and Pennsylvania,—in Massachusetts in advance before it was framed, in the Shay Rebellion; and in Pennsylvania afterwards, in the Whiskey Insurrection. In the South it slumbered for a long time, and showed itself on a grand scale in the great Rebellion. The conclusion of the war was, we may hope, the final adoption of the Constitution.

Thus far, briefly, in regard to the excellences of the Constitution. We refer those of this learned body, who wish to pursue the subject further in its more minute details, to the numerous expounders of the Constitution, great and small, mentioned in the beginning of this essay, not overlooking *The Federalist*, Story on the Constitution, Kent's Commentaries, Chief Justice Marshall's decisions, the speeches of Webster, Calhoun and other bright stars that glitter in our political firmament.

But now a few words in regard to its defects. Are there any,

and if there are, is it wise for us here to refer to them? We place ourselves under the broad banner of the Constitution itself, which allows everybody freedom of speech, and take the responsibility of referring to a few things in which it may be lacking.

In the first place, our Constitution is a written one. This is often considered as one of its chief merits; and other nations are beginning to copy after us in this respect—even Japan. It was a comparatively easy matter for us to get up such a written document, because other nations had supplied us with the material. We did not as a nation begin in savage life, but started with all the culture, civilization and experience of the past. Other nations did not begin their history thus—nor indeed could they—with written constitutions. The Constitution of England has not yet been written out. It has, however, there an actual existence, as a living power, an organic law, known and read of all men; growing, expanding or changing, just as it may be necessary in promoting the greatness and glory of England. The written constitution is a human production. The living, actual constitution is a part of the divine idea of humanity, which is not an abstraction, but a real concrete force or power. It is the form which the State assumes as included in the more general idea of man, who is certainly a reality.

There are many advantages in written constitutions, but there are also some disadvantages growing out of them, as our past history shows. Such instruments represent the thoughts and judgment of a particular age or juncture in history; but a nation grows, enlarges its views, and so it tends to outlive its written constitution, and it becomes difficult to reconcile its progress with what has become a tradition—it may be, a sacred tradition of the past. To suppose that a class of men at any particular period can lay down either a political or religious belief that will answer in all respects for all ages is to attribute to them supernatural wisdom. The Bible is the only document that has in any degree come up to this requirement; and some

unwisely imagine that even it will in the course of time become obsolete. To meet this difficulty, a written constitution may make room for amendments from time to time, as our own does. But the "mode of amendment," says one of our political writers, "which it provides may be so intricate or difficult as to restrict the action of the people, so that this fundamental right shall be more effectually wrested from them than by the most consummate tyranny." This remark, we apprehend, applies to our Constitution. Congress can propose an amendment to the people, but only when two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or two-thirds of the several State Legislatures shall call for it, and then it becomes part of the Constitution only when three-fourths of the Legislatures of the several States (or conventions) shall have ratified it. Now, when the people of the country are divided on some vital, fundamental point, an amendment is practically an impossibility. So it was with the question of slavery in the Constitution. There was, in fact, no possibility of getting it out except by war and revolution. We all know what difficulty our most astute statesman had in getting it out even after the war. Schleiermacher, in his *Christliche Sitte*, says: "A constitution which has no place for amendment is absolutely immoral, for it sets itself forth as absolutely perfect. It is far more immoral than the unlimited power of the monarch. . . ." Again, "Whoever will have a government that cannot follow its living conviction sets the dead over the living, and denies the moral development of the state." The English Constitution, as already remarked, is not so stiff and inflexible as ours. It is something that grows with the growth of the nation and changes with its progress and enlightenment. The people of England, that is, those who vote, can change the House of Commons at any time and make fundamental changes whenever it is necessary. They are, in fact, accustomed to do so. The crown and the House of Lords can, of course, interpose obstructions, but only to prevent the changes from taking place too rapidly. Hence the quiet and comparatively peaceful progress of the English nation.

But if our own Constitution is of such an inflexible character, what is our relief? Is the nation to be held, as it were, in a vice, and prevented forever from advancing beyond the political wisdom of a hundred years ago? Fortunately, there is no urgent call for any great changes in the Constitution for the present, nor perhaps for centuries to come. There are, however, cases of frequent occurrence where there is an apparent or real conflict between the letter of the Constitution and the spirit of our legislation, which gives rise to no small amount of political excitement and discussion all over the country. What, then, is our relief? We have good common sense, are smart and clever, and we have a safe and easy escape out of these difficulties, and usually settle them at the polls every now and then. We have two methods of interpreting the constitution—the one strict and literal, and the other more liberal and constructive. The strict constructionist denies, for instance, that we have any right to establish a national bank; to add new territory, as Jefferson maintained when we purchased Louisiana from the French; and in our own day, and even since the time of Henry Clay, that we have any right to establish a tariff to protect home industries whenever it is necessary for our growth and prosperity. General Jackson maintained that he had no authority in the Constitution as President of the United States to appoint days for fasting or thanksgivings, and so he signed his proclamations simply as a private individual, as Andrew Jackson, a citizen. So also Col. R. M. Johnson maintained once in a long report in regard to carrying the mails on Sunday. The strict constructionist probably interprets the Constitution correctly; but then it is the mere written Constitution that he has in view; the people, however, take a different view of the subject, and they have in their eye the unwritten constitution and get their interpretations from it. We have thus, in fact, two constitutions—the one formal and written, the other unwritten, the real living, organic law of the land. The latter is manifestly the living, moving power in our national life. During the war the written Con-

stitution had to be violated over and over again; but the nation was true to its unwritten law, and, obeying the law of self-preservation, maintained itself intact. The United States Bank was a useful institution in its day, but, as Mr. Webster said, it became an "obsolete idea." Our Presidents and Governors officially appoint days for prayer and tell the people to go to church to worship God. In regard to Sunday mails, we do as we think best, notwithstanding Dick Johnson's voluminous report to the contrary. The tariff we refer to a commission of wise men to ascertain what kind of a tariff would be best for the country; and we add one territory after another to the national domain—Texas, California and Alaska, and after a while we will annex Mexico and Central America, if it is necessary to our growth and prosperity, notwithstanding Mr. Jefferson's constitutional scruples.

The distinction here made between a written and an unwritten constitution is thus justified by the facts of our history. We regard it as a necessity, within certain limits, to the progress of the nation. It is safe ground on which to stand. It is simply following the example of our English cousins, who, with their unwritten constitution, manage so well to get out of difficulties and prevent revolutionary outbreaks.

"The constitution of the political people," says Mulford, in his book on the "Nation," p. 145, "has a two-fold character. The one is the development, the nation in history,—the historical constitution; the other is the formula which the nation prescribes for its order,—the enacted constitution; the one is the organism; the other is the form for the organization." "The unwritten constitution," says Dr. O. Bronson, when he was still a Protestant and a politician, "is simply a law ordained by the nation or the people instituting and organizing the government. The unwritten constitution is the real or actual constitution of the people as a state, or as a sovereign community, and constituting therein such or such a state. It is providential—not made by the nation, but born with it." De Maistre, the French writer, says: "The fundamental prin-

ciples of all political constitutions exist before all written law. The constitutional law is, and can only be, the development or sanction of an unwritten, pre-existing right. That which is most essential, most intrinsically constitutional and fundamental, is never written, and could not be, without endangering the state."

This development of the fundamental political idea must not, however, be carried too far. It should be just, legitimate and historically logical, else the written constitution, the outward form, will go to pieces. Thus the unwritten constitution cannot be construed so as to permit women to vote for the President. Nobody thinks of that, and so our patriotic ladies ask for an amendment that will give them this right. We are inclined to favor their request, but we fear that it is something impracticable on account of the great difficulty in carrying an amendment to the Constitution. Still, we believe that, if the ladies all over the United States were in favor of the change, their request would be granted and the amendment made. It would be also an *amende honorable* on the part of the men.

Here it would be proper to consider certain theories in regard to government in general, and to our Constitution in particular, such as these: that the nation is a necessary evil; an historical accident; a social contract or compact entered into to promote purely secular interests; or a grand system of police, with authority merely to protect our lives, property and sacred honor; and hypotheses of a similar character. We simply refer to them here, and turn to another point, which will become more and more a live question as we go on in the progress of our development.

According to the written Constitution of the United States, all religion and Christianity seem to be barred out. The name of the Supreme Being does not appear at all in that instrument, and all authority is regarded as coming from the people. No reference whatever is made to the State as a divine institution. From this it might be inferred that it was intended to ignore the institutions of religion altogether, as

something not entering into the organic law of the nation. So it has been maintained by some strict constructionists, besides General Jackson. For a long time one of our United States Senators regularly opposed the election of a chaplain for the Senate as unconstitutional. But a great deal of this sort of pedantry has passed away, as something outlived and outgrown. We have chaplains, Christian funeral services in the capitol; Sunday is observed as a day of rest by Congress; the oath is administered with the book of divine revelation; and the different Christian denominations are called on to co-operate with the Government in the civilization and instruction of the Indians. All this shows progress in the growth of the unwritten constitution, and generally it is coming to be believed that all laws and all authority for such a nation as ours must have their basis in Christianity. Government and Christianity are coming together slowly, and the time, we may hope, is approaching when everywhere among us it will be freely admitted that God hath joined these two things together, and that no one has a right to put them asunder.

The correct theory of the relation of the Church to the State has not yet been settled in this—not much more so, probably, than in the old—world. It is one of great difficulty. There are here two extremes, and we stand on the left wing. Our position is manifestly the reaction of the corruptions and abuses of the order of things which had existed in the Old World from time immemorial.

There are certain principles bearing on this subject which are incontestable: that God is the Supreme Ruler of the universe; that He is the author and source of all law and of all lawful authority, and that nations and governments are just as much bound to be subject to His law as the humblest individual. "Law has its home in the bosom of God, and its voice is the harmony of the world."

Further, that this great Being has revealed Himself in His Son, the Christ, and given Him all authority and power in heaven and earth, so that He may be King of kings and Lord

of lords, with power to raise the nations from their degradation and to enable them to serve Him as the end and happiness of their being.

As these things are so, then we say that all governments, our own included, must in some sense be, not only Theocratic, but Christocratic. The same command that had gone forth that to Christ every knee shall bow and every tongue confess applies to kingdoms and empires and republics no less than to the humblest being on the earth.

We, of course, in our experience as a nation, have not yet reached that point, and we may ask the question, How are we to get there? We do not think it can be accomplished by amendments to the Constitution, by inserting the name of God at the beginning, the middle or the end. Such amendments, as we have seen, are impracticable. It would take a long time to get three-fourths of our people to vote for them. And even if they were passed, it is not certain that they would amount to anything more than an empty profession. So also we do not think that the object can ever be accomplished in the way proposed by Richard Rothe, who maintains that the State should be so clarified as to be able to take up and absorb the Church and its functions. The only solution then left is to be found in the course of historical development. Let the unwritten constitution grow and expand in the lives of our Christian people until it gets fully into the kingdom of God, and becomes an obedient and efficient servant of Christ.

Notwithstanding our wickedness and badness as a people, we believe that we, as Americans, are nevertheless slowly tending in that direction—which is the proper end and goal of history. A new political science, which, however is not new, is growing up among us and bringing us to the old stand-point of our fathers in Church and State. The words of Washington, who himself was not satisfied with everything in the Constitution, are known to all. Winthrop, one of the Pilgrim Fathers, with his love for popular rights, said on one occasion,

when the Spirit was in him: "The civil state must be raised out of the churches."

We here quote a few passages from a remarkable book on our Constitution, written by Elisha Mulford, LL.D., styled, "The Nation: the Foundationist of Civil Order and Political Life in the United States," as illustrating the theocentric and christocentric tendencies of our times:

"The nation as it exists in its necessary conception is the Christian nation (or state, as he means). The law, by which the nation is judged is the law which Christ has revealed in His humanity. In Him the divine unity and the divine relations of humanity are revealed. He has shared the life of man—of every man. In Him humanity is manifested in that infinite sacredness which it has in the divine and eternal image. It is only as the nation recognizes the law of humanity which He has revealed that it attains the realization of its being. It is only as the nation acknowledges in history the infinite worth of humanity, which He has manifested, that it can become a power in history, which is but the realization of the divine revelation which He has wrought.

"The only foundation, then, upon which man can build in the life of the individual or of society is in Him. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is lying.' It is in the law which is revealed in Christ that the solidarity of human society is manifested. It is formed on no selfish principle. It becomes evident that no man lives for himself. Each is the minister of the whole.

"The nation (or state) is formed as a power on earth. It is invested with power of God; its authority is conveyed through no intermediate hands, but is given of God. It is clothed with His majesty on the earth. It is ordained of God to do this service. It is the *Theou diaconos*—the deacon of God. Rom. 12: 5."

Many other passages of like import could be quoted from this author. His book is an admirable one, showing that the author has studied the great writers in political science in Germany, France, England and America. It is in advance of Lieber and other American writers. It is worthy of a careful reading and study. It was published in Boston in 1881.

Our political science is largely empirical. It savors too much of the philosophy of years ago, and we are getting tired of it. It has a spiritual and ideal side. Let us now have more of that.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. BY Philip Schaff. *Christianus Sum: Christiani nihil a me alienum puto. Vol. IV. Mediæval Christianity, from Gregory I. to Gregory VII. A.D. 590-1073.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.

It is a rich feast to sit down and commune with Mediæval Church history through this fine volume of 800 pages. For years we have been anxiously waiting for it, for we expected something excellent, especially on this age. We knew from former years something of Dr. Schaff's warm enthusiasm over the church history of the Middle Ages. Some forty years ago, when he wrote and published his *Principle of Protestantism*, he outlined in idea the significance of this age in church history. The idea that Protestantism was a legitimate outgrowth of the Latin Church of this age was then comparatively new in the historical world—the world of church historians, and especially quite new in this country. It was looked upon only as an age of intellectual darkness and of superstition,—an age during which the Christian Church had been supplanted by a corrupt hierarchy which obtained the epithet, Synagogue of Satan. Neander, Dr. Schaff's preceptor, had led the way in bringing forward a deeper view of the history of the Church, especially the theory of historical development, according to which the history of the Church is an organic whole, a gradual unfolding through successive stages of the new creation in the world. According to this theory, the Church of the Middle Ages was a legitimate outgrowth of primitive Christianity, during which Christianity adapted itself to the new material and new surroundings by which it was confronted, and then when the Reformation of the 16th century came in, Protestantism arose as the product and birth of the best life of the centuries that immediately preceded it.

We remember well, though we were then an unfledged youth of 15 or 16 years of age, the controversy to which the little work of Dr. Schaff, entitled the *Principle of Protestantism* in which this idea of historical development was set forth, gave rise in our Reformed Church, and with what suspicion it was received all over this country. It was charged with heresy for maintaining a historical organic connection between the Roman Church of the Middle Ages and the Protestant Church of the modern age. The question was asked, Can any good come out of the Mediæval Roman Church? The man who ventured to answer this question in the affirmative was charged with being in sympathy with Romanism—something of a Jesuit in disguise. In the theological centres all over this country the theory was regarded as a dangerous German speculation. So far as there was any idea of a historical connection or

continuity in the Christian Church, this was traced through the Middle Ages in a line of sects, such as the Paulicians, Manicheans, Albigenses and Waldenses, outside the Roman Catholic Church. It did not matter much how heretical those sects were if only they possessed the merit of antagonizing the Roman Church. As a general thing, however, there was very little idea of history at all as pertaining to the Church. Christianity was viewed as a system of revealed truth, settled and fixed for all time, and its historical continuity was not regarded as a characteristic of it. The Church was made up of individual believers, who might appear and disappear in history, so that no historical connection with the immediate past was considered necessary to guarantee the Christianity of the Protestant Church in the 16th century. The Church could utterly die out for a time, and then be resuscitated again *de novo*, in individual Christians, who were supposed to be born from the word of God in the Scriptures. The whole theory of Christianity and the Church that prevailed was unhistorical; indeed, there was very little idea of history itself in any form, as being an unfolding of the organic life of the race.

The idea of history in general, and of Church history in particular, as set forth in this treatise, was entirely new in America, and it was regarded as heretical and dangerous just because it was new. And when it was discovered that this novelty carried with it the giving of some credit to the Latin Church of the Middle Ages for the good that came out of it in the Reformation, the cry of heresy became intensified. Then the young writer (Dr. Schaff was only 25 or 26 years of age at the time) brought out a negative side in Protestantism also, and spoke of sect and schism as being a disease in Protestantism that should be overcome and thrown off by its healthful life, and this was regarded also as indicating his sympathy with Romanism. That was at the time when what became known subsequently as Mercersburg theology was just taking root in the institutions at Mercersburg, and beginning to permeate the ministry and congregations of the Reformed Church.

It is not our purpose to trace the rise of this theology, nor to speak of the agitation the movement caused in the Reformed Church, and the wide-spread opposition it produced in other Protestant bodies towards the Reformed Church. We refer to it merely to direct attention to the wonderful change that has taken place in the theology of this country in reference to this subject.

That work of Dr. Schaff's, which contained the salient points in his theory of Church history, and which is carried out and applied in his still unfinished work on Church history, is now received everywhere as orthodox. It has been republished, we believe, and is received with general favor. We could only wish that it were more widely circulated and read, especially by the students in our theological seminaries, as well as by ministers generally.

It is in this IVth vol. of Dr. Schaff's Church history that the theory finds special application. It governs the whole general conception of Mediæval Church history, and it will have to be carried out more fully by the author when he comes to treat of the preparation for the Reformation, and the rise of the Reformation itself.

This is why in general we welcome this volume of Dr. Schaff's Church history. We were anxious to see the subject treated by him according to his own theory of Church history. It is true that within the last

forty years since the Principle of Protestantism appeared, this gap in Church history has been ably filled up by other writers. Especially has Milman, in his *History of Latin Christianity*, traversed this field with rich enthusiasm and captivating diction, so that his history possesses the interest of a romance. Others have written upon it since Neander. But we were prepared to hail something unique, and in many respects superior, in the vol. of Dr. Schaff. And we have not been disappointed. He expected at one time, we believe, to cover this ground in one volume, whereas now we have a vol. of 800 pages covering only half the ground, reaching to A.D. 1073, leaving four and a half centuries for another volume.

The next volume, covering the period from Gregory VII., Hildebrand, 1073, to the beginning of the Reformation, 1517, will be in some respects more interesting than this. This latter period is the more productive period of the Middle Ages. It includes the great migrations of nations, the Crusades, which broke up and reunited, under different combinations, the great populations of Europe, and especially the great intellectual movement in scholasticism, when the great universities were founded and reached their highest prosperity. Such celebrated scholars and divines as Anselm, Roscellinus, William of Champeaux, Peter the Lombard, Abelard the brilliant lecturer, and, towering above them all, Thomas Aquinas, the Doctor Angelicus, the intellectual giants pass before the view of the historian, and afford the opportunity of setting forth their truly wonderful genius and great systems, such as the *Summa* of St. Thomas.

Then come into the field the lines of preparation for the Reformation, which gather up in themselves the best positive struggles of the age to surmount its own cycle of life and activity and to emerge into a higher and freer Christianity. These movements of preparation divide into the positive and negative, &c., &c.

But while this next volume will cover a more interesting period, yet this 4th volume is full of interest as presenting the foundations for the great work of the Middle Ages.

INTRODUCTORY HEBREW METHOD AND MANUAL. By William R. Harper, Ph.D., Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew, 1885. Price, \$2.00.

The author of this work is the Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages in the Baptist Theological Seminary at Chicago, and the Principal of the Institute of Hebrew. He has won a wide and just reputation, not only for his scholarship, but especially for his skill and success in teaching Hebrew. We desire to call the attention of our readers to his method. The study of Hebrew is commonly regarded as dull and uninteresting. And no marvel, where, as in the ordinary method of teaching the language, the student is, first of all, required to master the whole grammar and undergo the drudgery of memorizing its dry paradigms, and then is plunged headlong into the Biblical text to apply, as best he can, what he is supposed to have learned. In fact, only a few of the most earnest students come to the translation of the Old Testament with an adequate knowledge of the principles and forms of the language, and even these few have as yet no Hebrew vocabulary with which to work; this must now be acquired by looking up the words as they occur in the lexicon, looking them up time and again till they become familiar. The task is uninviting in the extreme; and we may not wonder that the

great majority of those who enter on the study of Hebrew learn little or nothing of the language, and forget that little almost before it is learned. A new method is needed, and this Dr. Harper has furnished. The method is inductive. *First*, the student gains some of the facts of the language; *secondly*, he learns from these facts the principles which they illustrate and by which they are regulated; *thirdly*, he is made to apply these principles in manifold ways in translating from English into Hebrew, as well as from Hebrew into English. The three processes are carried on simultaneously from the first hour's work. In this way the labor of acquiring the language becomes comparatively light and is always pleasant, and even the work of memorizing as here carried on by easy stages, ceases to be a drudgery. A few months' trial in the class-room by the writer of the present notice has given him an exalted opinion of the value of this method.

The volume, whose title we have given above, consists of two parts: *An Introductory Hebrew Method*, comprising 170 pages, and a *Hebrew Manual*, comprising 93 pages. To begin with the *Manual*: it contains (I.) the pointed Hebrew text of the first four chapters of Genesis. The text used is that of Baer and Delitzsch. Chapters I. and II. give only the most important accents: Chapter III. gives in addition the accents of secondary value; the remaining chapters give all the accents. This is followed (II.) by a literal translation of the first four chapters of Genesis; (III.) by the unpointed text, which the student, from the first lesson, learns to read almost as easily as the pointed text; (IV.) a transliteration of the first chapter, in which the Hebrew words are divided into their syllables, and the naturally long and the tone long vowels are carefully indicated; (V. the Hebrew text of Genesis, Chapters (V.)-VIII.; (VI. and VII.) a Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew vocabulary on Gen. I.-VIII.; and (VIII.-IX.) word-lists.

This *Manual* is intended to accompany the *Introductory Hebrew Method*, which consists of fifty lessons covering the first eight chapters of Genesis. Each lesson is based on one or more verses of the Hebrew text. The first lesson for, example, is on Gen. i: 1. It comprises *first* a series of *notes* in which each word is analyzed into its syllables, its consonants and vowel-sounds, with their equivalents in English and a literal translation. *Secondly*, *Observations* of a more general character. *Thirdly*, a *word-lesson*, which at first includes few words not contained in the verse or verses of the lesson, and which is to be learned in such a manner that when the English word is pronounced, the Hebrew equivalent will be given. *Fourthly*, a set of *exercises*, which are to be written on paper by the student when he prepares his lesson, copied on the board in the class-room, criticised by the instructor and class and corrected by each student on his paper. These exercises consist of translations from English into Hebrew and from Hebrew into English, and in the writing of Hebrew words in English letters and of transliterated Hebrew words in Hebrew letters. *Fifthly*, Topics for study, which are intended to furnish a *resumé* of the more important points touched upon in the lesson. From the second lesson onward there is always a *Grammar-Lesson* assigned in the "Elements of Hebrew," which we notice below; *principles of Syntax* are given as they come to view in the several lessons, and there is generally a *Note-Review*, designed to keep fresh in the mind what the student has already learned. Such is the character of the *Manual* and the *Method*, which are to be used together. The manner of using them

may be best explained by stating how the first lesson is given. The first word of Gen. i : 1, is written on the board, and the English equivalent of each consonant and vowel-sound indicated to the student. The word as a whole is then pronounced and the meaning given. The student is called upon to pronounce it and to give its meaning. The second word is taken up and treated in the same manner. Then the two words are pronounced together and their meaning given. After this each remaining word is considered ; and with each new word a review of all the preceding words is made. When he has thus learned to pronounce the entire verse, and to give a Hebrew word when its English equivalent is named, the student is shown the *Notes* on the verse as given in the *Method*, where, for his private study, he will find for substance the aid already given orally. His attention is also directed to the *Observations*, with most of which he has been made familiar by the previous work. At the following recitation he is required (1) to pronounce the verse without hesitation from the pointed Hebrew in the *Manual*. After this are taken up the *Notes*, the *Observations*, the *Word-lesson* and the *Exercises*. Thus, at the end of the first lesson, the student, without having studied the alphabet as a whole, has already learned 13 consonants and 9 vowel-sounds, gained a vocabulary of 12 Hebrew words, and acquired the ability to translate a number of short sentences from English into Hebrew and from Hebrew into English. At the end of the first chapter, which is covered by 15 lessons, there is a general Review, and at this time the student has a vocabulary of 102 different words and has mastered about 450 different forms. When he has gone through the 50 lessons of the *Method* he has learned thoroughly the first eight chapters of Genesis and has made a formal study of almost every important portion of the grammar.

By this system the study of Hebrew becomes a pleasure, and the writer has yet to hear the first complaint from a student that it is difficult or wearisome. Indeed, any one of moderate capacity can acquire from Dr. Harper's books a good working knowledge of Hebrew without a teacher; and we earnestly recommend those of our ministers, who have either not learned Hebrew or have forgotten what they learned, to make the attempt, assuring them that, with a little earnestness on their part, they will have the delight of reading the Old Testament in the original text.

ELEMENTS OF HEBREW BY AN INDUCTIVE METHOD. Sixth Edition. William R. Harper, Ph.D. Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew, 1885. Pp. 182. Price, \$2.00.

The first edition of this valuable grammar was issued in July, 1881 ; the sixth and last edition, which contains nearly one hundred additional pages and is entirely re-written, appeared in September, 1885. It forms an essential part of the author's system of teaching Hebrew, being constantly referred to in the *Introductory Method*. Yet it can be used independently as any other Hebrew grammar is used, and will be found one of the best guides to the study of the language. It differs radically from other grammars in common use, inasmuch as its method is inductive, as far as that was possible. "In the discussion of each subject there is first given sufficient data, either in the way of words taken from the text or of paradigms, to form a basis for the work. The words cited are from the early chapters of Genesis, with which the student is supposed

to be familiarizing himself, as the subjects are being taken up. Where these chapters furnish no suitable example, a word is taken from some other book, the chapter and verse being cited in each case. It is intended that the student shall feel in all his work that he is dealing with the actual facts of the language, and not with hypothetical forms. After the presentation of the 'facts' the principles taught by these facts are stated as concisely as possible." Though an elementary treatise, it is yet quite full, and while it does not aim to take up the exceptions and anomalies of the language, it will be found to contain a treatment of all that is essential and to include everything of importance which can be classified. By a minute system of transliteration, the exact force and value of the several consonants and vowel-sounds are given, and thus the attention of the student is directed from the very beginning to the details of the vowel system, without a correct knowledge of which all effort at mastering the language will prove vain. The treatment of the various vowel-sounds is very full, each sound being treated separately, and the laws which regulate its occurrence and the grammatical forms in which it appears being carefully noted. Moreover, the book is thoroughly scientific, being based on the best and latest authorities. The strong verb, for example, is in every case referred to the primary form or ground-form from which the form in use has arisen in accordance with the phonetic laws of the language. Only in this way can the weak verb be explained. The arrangement throughout is clear, and the statement of principles concise and accurate. The mechanical execution is admirable and there is an unusual absence of typographical errors. We have no doubt that the *Elements of Hebrew* and *The Introductory Method and Manual* will contribute much to the advancement of Hebrew learning, and it is not surprising that they have already been introduced into thirty or more of our Theological Seminaries. We anxiously await the Hebrew Syntax on which Dr. Harper is now engaged and which will appear next summer.

THE PENTATEUCH: ITS ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE. By Edward Cone Bissell, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885. 8vo. Pp. VI. and 484. Price \$3.00.

The criticism of the Pentateuch has within the last few years awakened in this country a high degree of interest; and it is probable that in the near future it will awaken a still higher degree. Nor is this to be regretted, in spite of the bitter controversy it may engender. There are many problems awaiting a solution; and we are convinced that the English mind, whether in America or in Britain, is better fitted, by its reverence for the Bible and its practical good sense, to deal with these problems in a sober, judicious way than the German mind, which, with all its learning and penetration, is constitutionally speculative. A German professor's head does not always sit square on his shoulders; it is apt to be somewhat unbalanced; and, besides, such is the intellectual competition and rivalry in the land of great universities, that each scholar feels himself bound to set up a new theory, or at least to make essential modifications of an old one. He is tempted to seek originality rather than truth. The English mind is better trained to scrutinize facts and weigh evidence, and if ever the vexed questions of the higher criticism obtain a final answer, we must look for it in England or America, rather than in Germany, Holland or France.

We regard it as a symptom of a present healthy intellectual life and a good omen for the future that two such important works as this of Dr. Bissell, whose title we have given above, and that of Dr. Green, which we notice below, should have issued from the press a few days apart. Both deal with Pentateuch criticism, which virtually involves the criticism of the whole Old Testament,—the History, the Prophecy and the Psalms, as well as the Law. Both are written in opposition to the latest criticism of the Wellhausen school, which places the Prophets before the Law. Both are able, both are conservative, and whatever attitude the reader may occupy toward the questions discussed, he cannot fail to acknowledge that both authors are formidable antagonists, capable of dealing hard blows.

Dr. Bissell's book is manifestly the result of a severe mental struggle. "While pursuing Old Testament studies," he says, "in the University at Leipsic, some years since, the writer became warmly interested in the subject of Pentateuch criticism, especially in connection with the more private societies (*Gesellschaften*) of Delitzsch and Guthe, where it was made the chief topic of discussion. Having once entered upon it, he found the questions it raised of too grave a nature to be relinquished without a serious effort at settlement. In fact, in view of the startling conclusions reached by an eminently respectable portion of German scholarship, he felt bound to give reasons, at least to himself, for his faith in an Old Testament revelation." It is the author's honest endeavor to uphold the traditional view of the origin and structure of the Pentateuch; but while he regards this view as much better supported than the one now most widely current in Germany, he does not beguile himself with the illusion that there are no serious difficulties in it still remaining to be solved. His contention is mainly against the latest school of Old Testament criticism, of which Wellhausen is the ablest representative. After an introductory chapter, in which he attacks the leading critical principles of the school and the style of interpretation necessary for the successful defence of its theories, he gives a full historical sketch of Pentateuch criticism, especially of its latter stages. This is followed by a searching examination of Wellhausen's proposed analysis of the Pentateuch into several collections of laws, representing as many distinct periods of time, with a view to discover what fair conclusion may be drawn from a comparison of these several legal codes as respects the place of worship, the offerings, the feast and the priests and Levites. The author then enters upon a discussion of the Laws peculiar to Deuteronomy; the Laws repeated and modified in Deuteronomy; the Laws peculiar to the Priests' code; the Unity and Genuineness of Deuteronomy; the Law and the Prophets; the Law and the Historical Books; and the Law and the Psalms. Every law of the Pentateuch, except a few in Exodus having no important bearing on the subject, is brought under review and conveniently tabulated, and its relations to the later books of the Old Testament are clearly set forth. The scope of the book is broad and its treatment of the subject comprehensive and thorough. The author displays extensive scholarship, unusual familiarity with the literature of his subject, patience in the investigation of minute details, fairness in dealing with his opponents, candor in the statement of his own views and honesty of purpose. As to his success in the refutation of modern critical theories, opinions will differ according to

he point of view of the reader. The general habit of thought, even more than the science, will determine the conclusion. An argument that seems strong to one honest man will seem weak to another, who is equally honest. But there can be no question as to the ability of Dr. Bissell's book. We should yet add that an exhaustive bibliography of the literature of the Pentateuch and the related criticism of the Old Testament, occupying more than sixty pages, will prove of great value to the student.

THE HEBREW FEASTS in their Relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses concerning the Pentateuch. By William Henry Green, New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, Pp. VII. and 329. Price, \$1.50.

This consists of a course of lectures, delivered at Newton Theological Institution at the request of the Faculty and published at their instance. The author's purpose, like that of Dr. Bissell, is to refute the Wellhausen theory, which maintains "that the religious institutions of Israel, as these are exhibited in the Pentateuch, are not the product of one mind or of one age, but are the growth of successive ages; that the laws in which they are enacted, and which have been commonly attributed to Moses, are really composite and are divisible into distinct strata, which are referable to widely separated periods; and that the growth of these institutions can be traced in the laws which ordain them from their primitive simplicity to those more complicated forms, which they ultimately assume. And it is further claimed that this result, which is reached by an analysis of the laws, is verified by the statements of the history, provided that the history itself is first subjected to proper critical treatment, and its earlier and later elements are correctly discriminated." It is this critical hypothesis that is here put to the test by an examination of the Hebrew feasts. Dr. Green has limited himself to this one point, partly because the feasts are alleged to be one of the main props of the theory, and partly because the opponents of the theory have given less consideration to the feasts than to the sanctuary, the sacrifices and the priesthood. There are in all eight lectures: I. The Wellhausen Hypothesis in General; II. The History of Opinion respecting the Hebrew Feasts; III. and IV. The Unity of Exodus. Chapters 12 and 13; V. and VI. The Feast-Laws and the Passover; VII. The Feast of Weeks; and VIII. The Feast of Tabernacles. As was to be expected from the well-deserved reputation of its author, the book gives strong support to the traditional view of the origin and composition of the Pentateuch. Dr. Green is master of the whole field; he has the entire literature of his subject at his command; he has made a detailed examination of the positions assumed by the several critics. He never misrepresents their views, nor fears their arguments. And while he is ultra-conservative, it is plainly seen that he is thoroughly honest in his convictions and, therefore, earnest in setting them forth. In this book and in his former work, entitled "Moses and the Prophets," he has displayed great skill, as well as learning, in dealing with a theory which, however revolutionary, has commanded the assent of many of the best critics.

A LAYMAN'S STUDY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE. By Francis Bowen, LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885. Pp. 145. Price \$1.00.

A bright, interesting book, as all who are capable of appreciating fresh, original thought, vigorously yet beautifully expressed, will

readily testify. It gives us the results of the study bestowed by an intelligent and thoughtful layman on the English Bible considered in its literary and secular aspect. The discussion is not, and was not intended to be, either philological or theological in its character. It deals with the *English Bible*, not with the Hebrew and Greek texts, and with the English Bible simply as a book interesting to the student of literature, of poetry, of philosophy and of human nature. Yet even as thus limited, the subject will be found very broad. It is divided into six chapters: I. The Bible as an English Classic; II. The Narratives in the Old Testament; III. The Parables of our Lord—the Gospel Narrative; IV. The Philosophy of the Bible; V. The Poetry of the Bible; VI. The History contained in the Bible—the Character and the Institutions of Moses. The author's view of the Bible is very free. Many of the narratives he regards as legends, to be carefully distinguished from history on the one hand and poetry on the other,—"National traditions, such as had been repeated for centuries in the tents and at the camp-fires of the tribes; deeply tinged with national pride, and exaggerated through the same feeling and the natural love of the marvellous"; not authentic, therefore, in all their details, yet, withal, as objects of literary study, profoundly interesting and instructive. Notwithstanding this laxity, the book is pervaded by a tone of deep reverence for the Bible. The author has but little respect for the modern higher criticism, from whose speculations, he thinks, not much wisdom is to be learned. He is severe on the New Testament revisers, whose alterations, he charges, are "not for the better"; whose renderings are "stilted," "awkward and a spoiling of the rhythm," "uncouth and un-English"—"the consequences of intruding nineteenth century phraseology into the pure and musical idiom of the sixteenth century." The author has opinions of his own, which he does not hesitate to express frankly and strongly; and however much the reader may differ from him in his attitude toward the historical character of the Bible, he cannot fail, if attentive, to find himself quickened in his love for the Book of Books.

THE BLOOD COVENANT: *A Primitive Rite and its Bearings on Scripture.*
By H. Clay Trumbull, D.D. New York: Charles Scribners Son's, 1885.
Pp. VIII. and 350. Price \$2.00.

Whoever has read Dr. Trumbull's "Kadesh Barnea" will have formed large expectations of any new book from his pen. He will expect the fruits of broad scholarship, of wide reading, of patient research, of an earnest purpose and of a noble enthusiasm. Nor will he be disappointed in the present work, which, written in a clear, nervous and beautiful style, fascinates the reader by its freshness and novelty. It is the outgrowth of a series of lectures delivered in June 1885, before the Summer School of Hebrew in session at that time in the buildings of the Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia. The interest awakened by the lectures, as well as the importance of the subject they discuss, has rightly induced him to present them to a larger public in an enlarged form. The theme is new, and the treatment of it interesting and fresh. The author expresses just surprise that the chief facts of this entire subject have been so generally overlooked, in all the theological discussions and in all the physio-sociological researches of the earlier and the later times. Those facts are embodiments of

primitive and well-nigh universal convictions, which furnish a key for the explanation of much that is otherwise obscure. Such a fact is the right of blood covenanting—"a form of mutual covenanting, by which two persons enter into the closest, the most enduring and the most sacred of compacts, as friends and brothers, or as more than brothers, through the inter-commingling of their blood, by means of its mutual tasting or of its inter-transfusion." The first lecture is devoted to an account of this primitive rite, and of its wide sweep through the ages and the climes. Traces of it are found in Africa, in Asia, in America, in Europe, and in Oceanica. It was observed in ancient times; it is still observed to-day. The external form of the blood covenant undergoes various modifications, but its essential idea is everywhere the same; viz., that the blood is the life, and that blood-sharing, human or divine-human, secures an inter-union of natures. The second lecture, entitled "Suggestions and Perversions of the Rite," unfolds the sacred uses and the popular estimates of blood, in all the ages. The third lecture points out the Indications of the Rite in the Bible, as in circumcision, in the Passover, at Sinai, in the Mosaic ritual and in the Gospel; and it is here that the practical aim of the author comes to view. "All my thought," he says, "is to ascertain what new meaning, if any, is found in the Bible teachings concerning the uses and the symbolism of blood, through our better understanding of the prevailing idea among the peoples of the ancient world, that blood represents life; that the giving of blood represents the giving of life; that the receiving of blood represents the receiving of life; that the inter-commingling of blood represents the inter-commingling of natures; and that a divine-human inter-union through blood is the basis of a divine-human inter-union in the sharing of the flesh of the sacrificial offering as sacred food. Whatever other Bible teachings there are beyond these, as to the meanings of sacrifice, or as to the nature of the atonement, it is not my purpose, in this investigation, to consider." The book is a marvellous array of facts gathered from every quarter under heaven. The collection of them must have involved a wide range of reading. Nor are they facts that are simply curious, or of interest to the student of myth and folk-lore, of primitive ideas and customs, and of man's origin and history. They are facts that are of the highest value, especially to the theologian, on account of the bright light they cast on many pages of the Bible. Beliefs so deeply rooted in the human mind that they find expression in forms of blood-covenanting everywhere and at all times, cannot be devoid of truth, and must be taken into account, if only for their illustrative power, when we come to the interpretation of the Scripture. Indeed, they have an important bearing on Biblical doctrine, particularly on that of the incarnation, the atonement, and the Lord's Supper. It will be felt at once by every thoughtful reader that Dr. Trumbull, while indefatigable in gathering facts and in interpreting their underlying ideas, has not made the full application of which they are capable. He has opened up a rich vein which may be worked to advantage by the Christian theologian; and for this he deserves our sincerest thanks. We will only add that if any one wishes to spend a few hours in delightful and profitable reading, let him procure this book, which affords not only refreshment to the mind, but also beauty to the eye.

HISTORY OF THE UNITAS FRATRUM by Edmund De Schweinitz, S. T. D., Bethlehem, Pa. Moravian Publication Office. 1885. 8vo. pp. xxv. and 693.

This book supplies a need long and widely felt. The history of what is now commonly known as *The Moravian Church*, but which is also called *The Unitas Fratrum*, *The Unity*, *The Bohemian Brethren*, *The Brethren*, and *the Brethren's Church*, is one of thrilling interest. Its founders were Reformers before the Reformation, and the story of their ardent faith, their noble deeds and their cruel sufferings, the world will not willingly let die. And yet, prior to the publication of Bishop De Schweinitz's work, the merely English student, unacquainted with the German and Bohemian languages, had no access to a full, true and satisfactory history of this remarkable branch of the Christian Church. His sole recourse was to brief and antiquated narratives, like Cranz's *Ancient and Modern History of the Brethren* which appeared already in 1771, and 'Holmes' *History of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren*, 2 vols. published in London, 1825. Since then new and important sources have been discovered, especially the Lissa Mss., comprising fourteen folio volumes of historical documents, collected by the Brethren after the destruction of their earlier archives by fire in 1546. Thirteen of these Folios were found in 1836, at Lissa, and the fourteenth has since been discovered in the Bohemian Museum at Prague. They are now in the Archives at Herrnhut, having been purchased by the authorities of the Moravian church. These fresh sources have awakened renewed interest in the history of John Hus and his followers. They have been examined by learned historians who, on the basis of these new authorities, have produced valuable works, most of which, however, were written by Roman Catholics, and all of them in the German and Bohemian languages. It was time, therefore, that the results of the latest researches should be given in an English dress, and for this purpose no more fitting person could have been found than Bishop De Schweinitz. His general learning, his access to the best sources of knowledge, and his long study of the subject extending over nearly twenty years, eminently qualify him for the task. The present volume carries the history forward to the Renewed Unitas Fratrum 1722. It will be followed by a second volume, giving the later history of the Church from that point. The book is written in good style and is pervaded by an excellent spirit. It is not only interesting, but also very refreshing and profitable reading. We trust it will have a wide circulation.

MICROCOSMUS: An Essay Concerning Man and his Relation to the World. By Herman Lotze. Translated from the German by Elizabeth Hamilton and E. E. Constance Jones. In two volumes. New York: Scribner and Welford, 1885.

This book was originally published in German in three volumes during the years 1856-64, but it is now for the first time presented to students of philosophy in an English translation. Owing to the marked attention which, in various ways during the last few years, has been directed to the writings of Lotze, it is scarcely necessary for us to say that the work before us is one of great merit and replete with philosophic thought. The conclusion which the author desires to establish in it, is that the contest going on between the knowledge of the world of sense with its ever-growing wealth of exact science and the

persuasive force of intuitive facts on the one hand, and those vague convictions regarding the supersensuous world, which—not having an absolutely fixed and certain content—are hardly susceptible of proof, but—being sustained by an ever-renewed consciousness of their necessary truth—are still less susceptible of refutation on the other hand, is an unnecessary torment which we inflict upon ourselves by prematurely terminating investigation. "Vain," he maintains, "is every endeavor to resist the clear light of science, and to hold fast any view of which we have a haunting secret conviction that it is but an evanescent dream; but equally ill-advised is the despair that gives up that which must ever remain the immoveable centre of human civilization, whatever change of form it may undergo. Rather let us admit that in the obscure impulse to that higher aspect of things which we sometimes glory in, and sometimes feel incapable of rising to, there is yet a dim consciousness of the right path, and that every objection of science to which we attend does but disperse some deceptive light cast upon the one immutable goal of our longings by the changing stand-point of growing experience."

The work itself consists of nine books, or parts, which treat respectively of The Body; The Soul; Life; Man; The Mind; The Microcosmic Order, or the Course of Human Life; History; Progress; and The Unity of Things. From this it will at once be seen that it covers a wide range of subjects, both scientific and philosophic. Materialism and Spiritualism, Physiology and Psychology, Ethnology and Sociology, Ethics and Theology, Logic and Metaphysics, with the various profound questions pertaining to them, are all discussed in its pages in a most masterly manner and in a sincerely religious though thoroughly liberal spirit. Moreover the discussion throughout is conducted in a style entirely free from technical terminology and unusually clear for a treatise of its kind, so that these volumes are far more easily read and comprehended than the majority of metaphysical and theological books translated from the German.

We heartily commend the work to all our readers who are interested in the scientific and philosophical questions of the day. They will find it a rich mine of very instructive and profound thought.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL HANDBOOK TO THE EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY AND TITUS, by Joh. Ed. Huther, Th. D., Pastor, at Wittenförden bei Schwerin. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by David Hunter, B. A., and to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, by Dr. Göttlieb Lünemann, Professor in Theology in the University of Göttingen. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Rev. Maurice J. Evans, B. A. With a Preface and Supplementary Notes to the American Edition by Timothy Dwight, Professor of Sacred Literature in Yale College. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street, 1885.

This volume forms part of Meyer's *Commentary on the New Testament*. Being unable on account of the new editions called for, of his works, to comment on all the books of the New Testament, Dr. Meyer gave the Epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Hebrews to Dr. Lünemann, the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles to Dr. Huther, and the Apocalypse to Dr. Düsterdieck, who prepared the Commentaries on them. Though these Commentaries are not in all respects equal to those he himself prepared, they are, nevertheless, possessed of high merit and worthily complete his great work. Their value is increased

by the judicious supplementary notes of the American Editor. Those who possess the earlier volumes of this unsurpassed exegetical commentary will of course want this volume, and also the remaining two volumes on the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation of St. John which we are pleased to know will be published by Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls during the coming year.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture, By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn, Viaduct, London, Author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," the "Inner Life of Christ," etc. Vol. 1. The Book of Genesis. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street, 1885.

This is not a commentary in the usual sense of that term, but a collection of discourses on such portions of Holy Scripture as are of obvious and immediate importance to the growth of the soul in Divine wisdom. In these discourses, accordingly, the author does not go minutely through any book verse by verse, but seeks to set forth its governing idea or purpose, and to illustrate the same by commenting on the most striking instances which the book contains of the inspired writer's object in its preparation. "The purpose of the People's Bible," we are expressly told in the preface, "is pastoral; it aims so to bring all readers under the moral sovereignty of the Sacred Book as to arm them against temptation, enrich them with solid comfort, and fortify them with the wisdom of God."

In the present volume we have first a brief Introductory, then a number of discourses, or rather essays, treating respectively, in a masterly manner, of Inspiration, the Spiritual Organ, the Unknowable God, the Personal God, and God, the Explanation of all Things. These discourses or essays are followed by forty-two discourses on as many striking portions of the book of Genesis taken in regular order. The first two are on "The Unbeginning Beginning" and "The Making of Man," the last two on "Last Days of Jacob" and "Joseph's Death." The volume concludes with "'Handfuls of Purpose,' for all Gleaners," and the "Panorama of Genesis."

The book throughout is remarkable for its splendid diction and striking thoughts. No one can read it without being instructed and impressed by it. As a strong, original and brilliant thinker and writer Dr. Parker has few superiors.

"DEFENCE AND CONFIRMATION" of the Faith. Six Lectures Delivered before the Western Theological Seminary in the year 1885, on the Foundation of the Elliot Lectureship. Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 10 and 12 Dey Street; London, 44 Fleet Street, 1885.

This is an admirable and interesting book, and we can heartily commend it as an able and timely "defence and confirmation" of the faith. The following are the subjects treated in the different lectures, together with the names of the lecturers: (I.) "The Argument from the Messianic Prophecies," by Rev. William M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D., New York; (II.) "The Philosophy of Religion Considered as Pointing toward a Divine Redeemer of Men," by Rev. Carroll Cutter, D.D., President of Western Reserve College, Cleveland, O.; (III.) "Jesus Christ, the Unique Reconciler of Contradictions in Thought and Character," by Rev. Simon J. McPherson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.; (IV.) "An Apologetic for the Resurrection of Christ," by Rev. Nathaniel West, D.D., St. Paul, Minn.; (V.) "Christianity and Civilization," by Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, President

of the University of Wooster, Wooster, O.; (VI.) "Foreordination in Nature: As an Argument for the Being of God, Illustrated from the Maternal Instinct of Insects," by Rev. Henry C. McCook, D.D., Philadelphia.

All these lectures, without exception, are excellent, and deserve to be widely circulated and carefully read. They are especially well suited to meet the growing skepticism of our times.

SERMONS ON THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By John DeWitt, D.D., Professor of Church History, Lane Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885.

This volume is made up of twenty-seven sermons which treat in a practical way of various aspects and elements of human life in their relations to Christianity. All these sermons have been prepared with care and are possessed of more than ordinary merit. As they are of a truly edifying and instructive character the reading of them can scarcely fail to be profitable.

DR. DEEMS' SERMONS. Forty-eight Discourses, Comprising every Sunday Morning Sermon Preached from the Pulpit of "The Church of the Strangers," by the Pastor. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey street, 1885.

These sermons were delivered by Dr. Deems on the first forty-eight Sunday mornings in which he officiated in the edifice furnished the Church of the Strangers by the munificence of the late Cornelius Vanderbilt, Esq. They treat of a variety of Scripture subjects in an eminently practical and instructive way. In thought they are vigorous, in doctrine sound, and in style pleasing and attractive. They present truth in a manner especially adapted to the needs of Christians of the present day. They deserve to be widely circulated and read. An earlier edition met with much favor which no doubt will be the case with this edition also.

SERMONS. By T. DeWitt Talmage, Author of "Crumbs Swept Up," "The Abominations of Modern Society," "Second Series of Sermons," etc. Delivered in the Brooklyn Tabernacle. Phonographically Reported and Revised. First Series. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey street. 1885.

Dr. Talmage in the preface to this volume promises nothing for these sermons except that they are out of the old ruts. His admirers will no doubt be pleased with them. Certainly they do not run in the old ruts and in this respect fulfill the promise made in reference to them. Their excellencies are very marked, and so also, in our opinion, are their faults. In their presentation of truth they are always striking, but in their statement of facts not always as accurate as could be desired.

THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS. Volume III. Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian. I. Apologetic; II. Anti-Marcion; III. Ethical. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885.

This work, containing a translation of the writings of *Tertullian*, was sent to Dr. J.W. Nevin, as editor of the *MERCERSBURG REVIEW*, by direction, we presume, of his friend A. Cleveland Cox, D. D., the Editor-in-Chief of this new edition of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Dr. Nevin handed it over to the editors of this *Review* for notice. The theological public in this country must cordially thank Bishop Cox for undertaking this

work, and thanks are due also to his able coadjutors. Those who prepared this volume are Rev. Alexander Roberts, D. D., and James Donaldson, LL. D.

The whole work is an American reprint of the Edinburg Edition, revised and chronologically arranged, with brief prefaces and occasional notes. The volume here noticed contains something over seven hundred pages, and is very substantially and handsomely gotten up. In this respect it is an improvement of the Edinburg edition. Bishop Coxe says in the preface to this volume: "It is needful to remind the reader that he possesses in this volume what has long been a *desideratum* among divines. The crabbed Latin of the great Tertullian has been thought to defy translation; and the variety and uncertain dates of his works have rendered classification and arrangement almost an equal difficulty. But here is the work achieved by competent hands, and now, for the first time, reduced to orderly and methodical plan. We have little doubt that the student on comparing our edition with that of the Edinburg Series, will congratulate himself on the great gain of the arrangement; and we trust the original matter with which it is illustrated may be found not less acceptable."

It is not necessary to speak of the special interest of this particular volume in the series. Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, as he is named in his own stately and sonorous Latin, was, in many respects, one of the interesting, if not the most interesting, of the early Latin Fathers. He stands at the head of the Latin school, and prepared the way for Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine. His long life extended from A. D. 145 to 220, and some have given the date of his death as late as A. D. 240. He was not converted to Christianity until about the year A. D. 85. Dr. Schaff compares him to St. Paul and Luther. He was naturally an austere man, and inclined to asceticism, and this tendency was doubtless intensified by external causes in the Church. During his latter days he joined the Montanist sect, but notwithstanding this fact he has always been regarded by the Church as one of the greatest of the Church Fathers. And now that the Roman Church has decided in favor of Ultramontanism, and attributed infallibility to the Pope, Tertullian and his Montanism ought to rise in its favor.

We highly commend this volume as in every way worthy the labors that have been expended upon it.